Mass spectra in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD with additional colorless fields. Strong coupling regimes. II

Victor L. Chernyak [a, b]

(e-mail: v.l.chernyak@inp.nsk.su)

[a] Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS
630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation

[b] Novosibirsk State University,
630090 Novosibirsk, Russian Federation

arXiv:1609.00205v1 [hep-th] 1 Sep 2016

Abstract

This paper continues our studies in arXiV:1608.06452 [hep-th] of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ gauge theories in the strongly coupled regimes. We also consider here the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theories with $SU(N_c)$ colors (and their Seiberg's dual), with N_F flavors of light quarks and N_F^2 additional colorless flavored scalars Φ_i^j, but now with N_F in the range $N_F > 3N_c$.

The mass spectra of these direct and dual theories in various vacua are calculated within the dynamical scenario introduced by the author in [8]. It assumes that quarks in such $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theories without elementary colored adjoint scalars can be in two *standard* phases only. These are either the HQ (heavy quark) phase where they are confined or the Higgs phase. Recall that this scenario satisfies all those tests which were used as checks of the Seiberg hypothesis about the equivalence of the direct and dual theories. Calculated mass spectra of the direct $SU(N_c)$ theory are compared to those of its Seiberg's dual $SU(N_F - N_c)$ variant and appeared to be parametrically different.

Contents

1 Introduction **3**

Unbroken flavor symmetry $U(N_F)$ **6**

2 QCD vacua **6**
2.1 Direct theory 6
2.2 Dual Theory 7

3 L vacua **9**
3.1 Direct theory 9
3.2 Dual Theory 10

Broken flavor symmetry $U(N_F) \to U(\mathrm{n}_1) \times U(\mathrm{n}_2)$ **11**

4 Lt vacua **11**
4.1 Direct and dual theories 11

5 Special vacua **12**
5.1 Direct theory 12
5.2 Dual Theory 14

6 br1 vacua, $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \Lambda_Q^2/m_Q$ **16**
6.1 Direct theory 16
6.2 Dual Theory 17

7 Conclusions **19**

A Condensates and multiplicity of vacua at $N_F > 2N_c$ [4] **21**
A.1 Vacua with the unbroken flavor symmetry 22
A.2 Vacua with the broken flavor symmetry
$U(N_F) \to U(n_1) \times U(n_2), \quad 1 \le n_1 \le [N_F/2]$ 23

References **24**

1 Introduction

We continue in this article our previous study in [1] of strongly coupled $\mathcal{N}=1$ SQCD-like theories with $SU(N_c)$ colors (and their Seiberg's dual with $SU(N_F-N_c)$ dual colors), with N_F flavors of light quarks and with additional N_F^2 colorless but flavored fields Φ_i^j. But this time considered is the region $N_F > 3N_c$.

First of all, recall that the Lagrangian of the direct $SU(N_c)$ theory at the scale $\mu=\Lambda_Q$ has the form [1]

$$K = \mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi) + \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\, Q^\dagger Q + Q\to\overline{Q}\,\Big)\,, \quad \mathcal{W} = -\frac{2\pi}{\alpha(\mu=\Lambda_Q)}S + \mathcal{W}_{\rm matter}\,,$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_\Phi + \mathcal{W}_Q\,, \quad \mathcal{W}_\Phi = \frac{\mu_\Phi}{2}\left[\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^2) - \frac{1}{N_F-N_c}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\,\Phi\Big)^2\right], \quad \mathcal{W}_Q = \mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{Q}(m_Q-\Phi)Q\,. \quad (1.1)$$

Here: $\mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$ and $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ are the mass parameters, the traces in (1.1) are over color and/or flavor indices, $S=-\sum_{a,\beta} W_\beta^A W^{A,\beta}/32\pi^2$, where W_β^A is the gauge field strength, $A=1...N_c^2-1$, $\beta=1,2$, $a(\mu)=N_c\alpha(\mu)/2\pi = N_c g^2(\mu)/8\pi^2$ is the running gauge coupling with its scale factor Λ_Q, $Q_a^i, \overline{Q}_j^{\,a}$, $a=1...N_c$, $i,j=1...N_F$ are the quark fields, Φ_i^j are N_F^2 colorless scalars. *This normalization of fields is used everywhere below in the main text.* Besides, the perturbative NSVZ β_{NSVZ}-functions for (effectively) massless SUSY theories [2, 3] are used in this paper.

There is a large number of various type vacua in this theory and for a reader convenience we reproduce in Appendix the results from section 2 in [4] for the values of the quark and gluino condensates, $\langle\overline{Q}_j Q^i\rangle \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{N_c}\langle\overline{Q}_j^{\,a} Q_a^i\rangle$ and $\langle S\rangle$, in all different vacua at $N_F > 2N_c$.

This direct $SU(N_c)$ theory with $N_F > 3N_c$ quark flavors and $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ is IR free and logarithmically weakly coupled at scales $\mu < \Lambda_Q$, $a(\mu\ll\Lambda_Q)\sim 1/\log(\Lambda_Q/\mu) \ll 1$, while it is strongly coupled at $\mu > \Lambda_Q$, $a(\mu\gg\Lambda_Q)\sim(\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_Q<0} \gg 1$.

In parallel with this direct Φ-theory (1.1), we study also its Seiberg's dual variant [5, 6], the $d\Phi$-theory with $SU(\overline{N}_c = N_F - N_c)$ dual colors, N_F flavors of dual quarks $q_i^b, \overline{q}_b^{\,j}$, $b=1...\overline{N}_c$, and with N_F^2 additional colorless but flavored elementary fields M_j^i. Its Lagrangian at $\mu=\Lambda_Q$ looks as, see (1.1) for $\mathcal{W}_\Phi$,

$$\overline{K} = \mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi) + \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2}\right) + \mathrm{Tr}\left(q^\dagger q + q\to\overline{q}\right), \quad \overline{\mathcal{W}} = -\frac{2\pi}{\overline{\alpha}(\mu=\Lambda_Q)}\,\overline{S} + \overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\rm matter}\,,$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_\Phi + \mathcal{W}_{\Phi M} + \mathcal{W}_q\,, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\Phi M} = \mathrm{Tr}\,(m_Q^{\rm tot} M) = \mathrm{Tr}\,(m_Q-\Phi)M\,, \quad \mathcal{W}_q = -\,\mathrm{Tr}\left(\overline{\mathrm{q}}\,\frac{\mathrm{M}}{\Lambda_\mathrm{Q}}\,\mathrm{q}\right). \quad (1.2)$$

Here: the number of dual colors is $\overline{N}_c = (N_F - N_c)$, $\overline{q}_b^{\,j}, q_i^b$ are dual quark fields, $b=1...N_F-N_c$, M_j^i are N_F^2 Seiberg's elementary mion fields, $M_j^i \to (\overline{Q}_j Q^i)$, $\overline{a}(\mu)=\overline{N}_c\overline{\alpha}(\mu)/2\pi = \overline{N}_c\overline{g}^2(\mu)/8\pi^2$ is the dual running gauge coupling (with its scale parameter Λ_q), $\overline{S} = -\overline{\mathrm{W}}_\beta^{\,B}\,\overline{\mathrm{W}}^{\,B,\beta}/32\pi^2$, $\overline{\mathrm{W}}_\beta^{\,B}$ is the dual gluon field strength, $B=1...\overline{N}_c^2-1$. The gluino condensates of the direct and dual theories are matched, $\langle-\overline{S}\rangle = \langle S\rangle \equiv \Lambda_{YM}^3$, as well as $\langle M_j^i\rangle \equiv \langle M_j^i(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle = \langle\overline{Q}_j Q^i(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle \equiv \langle\overline{Q}_j Q^i\rangle$, and the scale parameter Λ_q of the dual gauge coupling is taken as $|\Lambda_q| = \Lambda_Q$.

[1] The gluon exponents are always implied in the Kahler terms. Besides, here and everywhere below in the text we neglect for simplicity all RG-evolution effects if they are logarithmic only.

In contrast to the direct $SU(N_c)$ theory (1.1), this dual $SU(\overline{N}_c = N_F - N_c)$ theory with $N_F > 3N_c$ is UV free and logarithmically weakly coupled at $\mu > \Lambda_Q$, $\overline{a}(\mu \gg \Lambda_Q) \sim 1/\log(\mu/\Lambda_Q) \ll 1$. But it is strongly coupled at $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$, with $\overline{a}(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim (\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_q > 0} \gg 1$.

If all N_F^2 fields Φ_i^j are too heavy and dynamically irrelevant, they all can be then integrated out and, instead (1.2), the superpotential will be

$$\overline{\mathcal{W}}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M + \mathcal{W}_q\,, \quad \mathcal{W}_M = m_Q \,{\rm Tr}\, M - \frac{1}{2\mu_\Phi}\left({\rm Tr}\,(M^2) - \frac{1}{N_c}({\rm Tr}\, M)^2\right). \tag{1.3}$$

As in the previous article [1], our purposes here is: a) to calculate mass spectra in both direct and dual theories (1.1),(1.2), b) to compare these two mass spectra in order to see whether they are the same or not.

Recall that in the region $N_c+1 < N_F < 3N_c/2$, $m_Q\mu_\Phi \ll \Lambda_Q^2$ considered in [1], all quark and gluon masses in *in all vacua* of both theories (1.1),(1.2) were much less than Λ_Q, so that in all vacua we have dealt with the direct theory (1.1) in the strong coupling regime with $a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \gg 1$, while the dual theory was in the weak coupling one, with $\overline{a}(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \ll 1$. As will be seen from the text below, this is not the case for the region $N_F > 3N_c$ considered in this paper. It turns out that: a) in some vacua the quark and gluon masses are much larger than Λ_Q, so that we have to deal with the strongly coupled direct theory (1.1) and the weakly coupled dual one (1.2), b) while in other vacua the quark and gluon masses are much smaller than Λ_Q, so that we have to deal with the weakly coupled direct theory and strongly coupled dual one.

Recall that, as was argued in detail in section 7 of [7], outside the conformal window $3N_c/2 < N_F < 3N_c$, the UV free direct theory (1.1) (without fields Φ) with $N_c + 1 < N_F < 3N_c/2$ and $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ enters smoothly at scales $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ into *the strongly coupled effectively massless perturbative regime* with the gauge coupling $a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim (\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_Q > 0} \gg 1$. In short, the arguments were as follows.

a) It was proposed by Seiberg in [5] for the standard direct (electric) $\mathcal{N} = 1$ $SU(N_c)$ SQCD (i.e. (1.1) without fields Φ) with $m_Q = 0$ that it is in the "confinement without spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking" (and without R-symmetry breaking) regime ($\langle \overline{Q}_j Q^i \rangle = \langle S \rangle = \langle \overline{q}^j q_i \rangle = \langle M_j^i \rangle = 0$). And the massless dual (magnetic) $SU(N_F - N_c)$ theory (1.2) (without fields Φ) was proposed as its low energy form at scales $\mu < \Lambda_Q$. This implies confinement of all original electric quarks and gluons, with the string tension $\sqrt{\sigma} \sim \Lambda_Q$ (with Λ_Q the only dimensional parameter), and formation of solitonic IR free $SU(N_F - N_c)$ theory with massless at $m_Q = 0$ magnetic quarks and gluons (and M_j^i fields). Besides, both direct and dual theories are considered in [5] as nonsingular nontrivial interacting theories at $m_Q = 0$.

b) As was argued in section 7 of [7], the problem with this scenario is that it is impossible to write at the scale $\mu \sim \Lambda_Q$ the effective Lagrangian of massive hadrons with masses $\sim \Lambda_Q$ (made of confined electric quarks and gluons), which will be nonsingular at $m_Q = 0$ and preserving both the R-symmetry and chiral symmetry $SU(N_F)_L \times SU(N_F)_R$. The problems with possibly massive (confined or not) electric quarks with masses $\sim \Lambda_Q$ are the same as those for hadrons. The nonsingular dynamically induced quark mass term in the superpotential will look as $\delta\mathcal{W} \sim \sum_{i,j=1}^{N_F} \langle \phi_i^j \rangle \, \overline{Q}_j Q^i$, $\langle \phi_i^j \rangle \sim \delta_i^j \Lambda_Q$. But, in any case, this will break spontaneously the exact chiral symmetry $SU(N_F)_L \times SU(N_F)_R$ of the $m_Q = 0$ theory. Besides, this (solitonic colorless or colorful) field ϕ has the positive R-charge, $R_\phi = 2N_c/N_F$. But, first, $\langle \phi_i^j \rangle \sim \delta_i^j \Lambda_Q$ will break spontaneously also the R-symmetry of the $m_Q = 0$ theory, while R-symmetry is considered in [5] as unbroken in both direct and dual theories (there is no corresponding massless Nambu-Goldstone boson). And second, the R-symmetry requires that any chiral (elementary

or composite) superfield Ψ with the R-charge $r > 0$ behaves as $\langle\Psi\rangle \sim (m_Q)^{rN_F/2N_c} \to 0$ at $m_Q \to 0$, and this forbids $\langle\phi_i^j\rangle \sim \delta_i^j \Lambda_Q$.

Besides, as was shown in section 7 of [7], at $N_c + 1 < N_F < 3N_c/2$, another scenario (which is the only possibility in the conformal window $3N_c/2 < N_F < 3N_c$) also does not work. In this scenario, according to reasonings given above, the direct theory with $m_Q = 0$ enters smoothly into the strongly coupled massless perturbative regime at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$. The IR free massless Seiberg's dual theory is considered as *independent theory* which presumably becomes equivalent to the direct one at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$.

As was argued in section 7 of [7] and Appendix of [4], the anomalous dimensions of the quark field Q_a^i and fion field Φ_j^i, γ_Q and γ_Φ, and the gauge coupling $a(\mu)$ in the direct theory behave in the strongly coupled regime (i.e. at $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$ at $N_c + 1 < N_F < 3N_c/2$ or at $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$ at $N_F > 3N_c$) as follows:

$$\gamma_Q = \frac{2N_c - N_F}{\overline{N}_c} \ , \quad \gamma_\Phi = -2\gamma_Q \, , \quad \overline{N}_c = N_F - N_c \, , \tag{1.4}$$

$$\frac{d\, a(\mu)}{d \log \mu} = \beta_{NSVZ}(a) = \frac{a^2(\mu)}{a(\mu) - 1} \, \frac{\mathrm{b_o} - N_F\gamma_Q}{N_c} \quad \stackrel{a(\mu)\gg 1}{\longrightarrow} \quad -\nu_Q \, a(\mu), \quad \mathrm{b_o} = 3N_c - N_F \, ,$$

$$\nu_Q = \frac{N_F\gamma_Q - \mathrm{b_o}}{N_c} = \frac{3N_c - 2N_F}{\overline{N}_c} = \gamma_Q - 1 \, , \quad a(\mu) \sim \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu}\Big)^{\nu_Q} \gg 1 \, .$$

From (1.4), in the region $N_F > 3N_c$ considered in this paper and at $\mu > \Lambda_Q$: $-1 < \gamma_Q < 0$, $0 < \gamma_\Phi < 2$, $-2 < \nu_Q < -1$. Besides, the gauge coupling of the $SU(N_c)$ SYM looks in the strong coupling regime as [7]

$$\frac{d\, a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{YM})}{d \log \mu} = \beta^{YM}_{NSVZ}(a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM}) = \frac{3(a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM})^2}{a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM} - 1} \quad \stackrel{a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM}\gg 1}{\longrightarrow} \quad 3\, a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM}(\mu) \, ,$$

$$a^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{YM}) \sim \Big(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_{YM}}\Big)^3 \gg 1 \, . \tag{1.5}$$

For the strongly coupled dual $SU(\overline{N}_c = N_F - N_c)$ theory (1.2) with $N_F > 3N_c$ the corresponding anomalous dimensions γ_q , γ_M , γ_Φ and the dual gauge coupling $\overline{a}(\mu)$ look at $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$ as

$$\gamma_q = \frac{2\overline{N}_c - N_F}{N_F - \overline{N}_c} = \frac{N_F - 2N_c}{N_c} > 1 \, , \quad \gamma_M = -2\gamma_q \, , \quad \nu_q = \gamma_q - 1 = \frac{N_F - 3N_c}{N_c} > 0 \, , \quad \gamma_\Phi = 0 \, , \tag{1.6}$$

$$\overline{a}(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu}\Big)^{\nu_q} \gg 1 \, , \quad \overline{a}^{\mathrm{str}}_{YM}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{YM}) \sim \Big(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_{YM}}\Big)^3 \gg 1 \, . \tag{1.7}$$

Recall also that the parametric behaviour and hierarchies of condensates are qualitatively different at $\mu_\Phi \lesseqgtr \mu_{\Phi,\mathrm{o}} = \Lambda_Q(\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{(2N_c - N_F)/N_c}$, see section 3 in [11] and section 2 in [4]. Therefore, because we consider in this paper the region $N_F > 3N_c$ and $\mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$, $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$, then $\mu_{\Phi,\mathrm{o}} \ll \Lambda_Q$ is very small and we always deal with the region $\mu_\Phi \gg \mu_{\Phi,\mathrm{o}}$ in this paper.

For calculations of mass spectra in various vacua in the strongly coupled regimes we use the dynamical scenario introduced in [8]. This scenario assumes that quarks in such $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theories can be in two *standard* phases only: these are either the HQ (heavy quark) phase where they are

confined, or the Higgs phase where they form nonzero coherent condensate, $\langle Q^i_a\rangle \neq 0$, breaking the color symmetry. The word *standard* implies here also that, in such theories without elementary colored adjoint scalars, no additional parametrically lighter solitons (e.g. magnetic monopoles or dyons) are formed at those scales where quarks decouple as heavy or are higgsed. [2]

The organization of the paper is as follows. The vacua with the unbroken $U(N_F)$ global flavor symmetry are considered in sections 2 and 3, in both the direct and dual theories. The vacua with the spontaneously broken $U(N_F) \to U(\mathrm{n}_1) \times U(\mathrm{n}_2)$ flavor symmetry are considered in sections 4-6. In Appendix, for a reader convenience, we recall from [4] the values of various condensates in different vacua at $N_F > 2N_c$.

Unbroken flavor symmetry $U(N_F)$

2 QCD vacua

There are N_c quantum QCD vacua at $\mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q \gg \mu_{\Phi,\mathrm{o}} = \Lambda_Q(m_Q/\Lambda_Q)^{(N_F-2N_c)/N_c}$. The condensates in the direct theory look in these vacua as, see Appendix,

$$\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD} = \langle \overline{Q}Q(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle_{QCD} \simeq \frac{\langle S\rangle_{\rm QCD} \equiv \langle \Lambda^{(\rm QCD)}_{YM}\rangle^3}{m_Q} \simeq \frac{1}{m_Q}\Big(\Lambda_Q^{\mathrm{b_o}} m_Q^{N_F}\Big)^{1/N_c}, \quad \frac{\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD}}{\Lambda_Q^2} \ll 1\,,$$

$$\langle m^{\rm tot}_Q\rangle = \langle m_Q - \Phi\rangle = \frac{\langle S\rangle_{\rm QCD}}{\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD}} \simeq m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q\,, \quad \langle\Phi\rangle \sim \frac{\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD}}{\mu_\Phi} \ll m_Q\,. \tag{2.1}$$

The condensates in the dual theory look as

$$\langle M\rangle_{QCD} \equiv \langle M(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle_{QCD} = \langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD}, \quad \langle \overline{q}q\rangle_{QCD} = \frac{\Lambda_Q\langle S\rangle_{\rm QCD}}{\langle M\rangle_{QCD}} \simeq m_Q\Lambda_Q \ll \Lambda_Q^2\,. \tag{2.2}$$

2.1 Direct theory

All quark and gluon masses are $\ll \Lambda_Q$ in this IR free logarithmically weakly coupled at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ direct $SU(N_c)$ theory, see (2.1). But something nontrivial takes place with masses of N_F^2 fions Φ^j_i. This direct theory with $N_F > 3N_c$ is strongly coupled at scales $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$, with the gauge coupling $a(\mu \gg \Lambda_Q) \sim (\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_Q<0} \gg 1$, see (1.4). The running mass $\mu_\Phi(\mu)$ of Φ looks as, see (1.4),

$$\mu_\Phi(\mu=\Lambda_Q) = \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q\,,\ \mu_\Phi(\mu\gg\Lambda_Q) = \frac{\mu_\Phi}{z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q,\mu)}\,,\ z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q,\mu)\Big(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\gamma_\Phi} \gg 1\,,\ \gamma_\Phi = -2\gamma_Q\ >\ 1\,. \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore, the running mass $\mu_\Phi(\mu)$ of fions *decreases* with increasing $\mu > \Lambda_Q$ and (if nothing prevents) $\mu_\Phi(\mu > \mu^{\rm str}_o) < \mu$, so that all N_F^2 fion fields Φ^j_i *become relevant* at scales $\mu > \mu^{\rm str}_o$, see section 4 in [11] and Appendix in [4],

$$\Lambda_Q \ll \mu^{str}_o = \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma_Q-1}} = \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{3N_F-5N_c}} \ll \mu_\Phi\,. \tag{2.4}$$

[2] In the logarithmically weakly coupled regimes the dynamics is simple and clear and we need no additional assumptions because this scenario is literally standard.

Thus, when we are going up in energy from $\mu = \Lambda_Q$, the fions are dynamically irrelevant in the interval of scales $\Lambda_Q < \mu < \mu_o^{\rm str} \ll \mu_\Phi$ where $\mu_\Phi(\mu) > \mu$, but *become relevant* at $\mu > \mu_o^{\rm str}$ where $\mu_\Phi(\mu) < \mu$. This means that, because $\mu_\Phi(\mu = \mu_\Phi) \ll \mu_\Phi$, there is no pole in propagators of fions at $\mu \sim \mu_\Phi$, but there is a pole at $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_o^{\rm str} \ll \mu_\Phi$.

At $\mu < \mu_o^{\rm str}$ all fions become too heavy and dynamically irrelevant. Therefore, they all can be integrated out at $\mu < \mu_o^{\rm str}$, see (2.4), and the superpotential takes the form

$$\mathcal{W}_Q = m_Q {\rm Tr}(\overline{Q}Q) - \frac{1}{2\mu_\Phi}\left(\sum_{i,j}(\overline{Q}_j Q^i)(\overline{Q}_i Q^j) - \frac{1}{N_c}\Big({\rm Tr}\,\overline{Q}Q\Big)^2\right). \tag{2.5}$$

The last term in (2.5) is irrelevant at scales $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ (up to small power corrections). Therefore, the mass spectrum of the direct theory at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ will be the same as in the standard $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD without fields Φ. The quark mass is (up to ignored parametrically large logarithmic factor, see the footnote 1) $m_Q^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q$. The gluon mass due to possible higgsing of quarks is: $\mu_{gl} \sim \langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD}^{1/2} \ll m_Q$, see (2.1). Therefore, the **the overall phase is HQ** (heavy quarks). All quarks decouple as heavy in the weak coupling region at $\mu < m_Q^{\rm pole} \ll \Lambda_Q$. There remains $SU(N_c)$ SYM. The scale factor λ_{YM} of its gauge coupling is determined from matching $a_{(+)}(\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole}) = a_{YM}(\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole})$ and is $\lambda_{YM} = \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm QCD)}\rangle$ as it should be, see (2.1).

On the whole, the spectrum of masses looks as follows. -

1) The quark mass is $m_Q^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q$ (up to logarithmic factor). All quarks are weakly coupled and weakly confined (i.e. the tension of the confining string originating from $SU(N_c)$ SYM is $\sqrt{\sigma} \sim \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm QCD)}\rangle \ll m_Q$), see (2.1). Therefore, there is a large number of hadrons made from these weakly coupled non-relativistic quarks, their mass scale is $\mu_{\rm H} \sim m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$.

2) There is a large number of strongly coupled gluonia with the mass scale $\sim \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm QCD)}\rangle \ll m_Q$, see (2.1).

3) All N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j have large masses $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_o^{\rm str}$, see (2.4).

2.2 Dual Theory

The dual theory is strongly coupled at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$, with the dual gauge coupling $\overline{a}(\mu = \Lambda_Q) \sim 1$, $\overline{a}(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim (\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_q > 0} \gg 1$. The dual Lagrangian at scales $\mu_q^{\rm pole} < \mu < \Lambda_Q$ has the form, see (1.2),(1.6),

$$K = {\rm Tr}\left[\Phi^\dagger\Phi + z_M(\Lambda_Q,\mu)\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2} + z_q(\Lambda_Q,\mu)\Big(q^\dagger q + \overline{q}^\dagger\overline{q}\Big)\right], \tag{2.6}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_\Phi + {\rm Tr}\left[m_Q^{\rm tot} M - \overline{q}\,\frac{M}{\Lambda_Q} q\right], \quad \mathcal{W}_\Phi = \frac{\mu_\Phi}{2}\left[{\rm Tr}\,(\Phi^2) - \frac{1}{\overline{N}_c}\Big({\rm Tr}\,\Phi\Big)^2\right], \quad m_Q^{\rm tot} = m_Q - \Phi\,,$$

$$z_q(\Lambda_Q,\mu) = \left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\gamma_q}, \quad z_M(\Lambda_Q,\mu) = \left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\gamma_M = -2\gamma_q}, \quad \gamma_q = \frac{2\overline{N}_c - N_F}{N_F - \overline{N}_c} = \frac{N_F - 2N_c}{N_c} > 0, \quad \gamma_\Phi = 0\,.$$

All N_F^2 fields Φ are heavy, $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$. Therefore, they all are dynamically irrelevant at $\mu < \mu_\Phi$ and can be integrated out. The dual Lagrangian becomes,

$$K = {\rm Tr}\left[z_M(\Lambda_Q,\mu)\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2} + z_q(\Lambda_Q,\mu)\Big(q^\dagger q + \overline{q}^\dagger\overline{q}\Big)\right], \tag{2.7}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M - {\rm Tr}\left(\,\overline{q}\,\frac{M}{\Lambda_Q} q\,\right), \quad \mathcal{W}_M = m_Q\,{\rm Tr}\,(M) - \frac{1}{2\mu_\Phi}\Big[{\rm Tr}\,(M^2) - \frac{1}{N_c}\Big({\rm Tr}\,M\Big)^2\,\Big]\,.$$

The potentially important masses look here as follows. The pole mass of dual quarks, see (1.6),

$$\mu_q^{\rm pole} = \frac{1}{z_q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_q^{\rm pole})}\,\frac{\langle M\rangle}{\Lambda_Q} \quad \to \quad \mu_q^{\rm pole} \simeq m_Q\,. \tag{2.8}$$

The gluon mass due to possible higgsing of dual quarks, see (1.6),(1.7),

$$\Big(\overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole}\Big)^2 \sim \Big[\overline{a}(\mu = \overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole}) = \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_q}\Big] z_q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole})\,\langle\overline{q}q\rangle\,, \quad \overline{a}(\overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole}) z_q(\Lambda_Q, \overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole}) \sim \frac{\overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole}}{\Lambda_Q}\,,$$

$$\overline{\mu}_{gl}^{\rm pole} \sim \frac{\langle\overline{q}q\rangle}{\Lambda_Q} \sim \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_c}} \ll \mu_q^{\rm pole}\,, \qquad \nu_q = \frac{3\overline{N}_c - 2N_F}{N_F - \overline{N}_c} = \frac{N_F - 3N_c}{N_c} \,>\, 0\,. \tag{2.9}$$

Therefore, **the overall phase is Hq** (heavy quarks). After integrating out all dual quarks as heavy at $\mu < \mu_q^{\rm pole}$ there remains $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ SYM in the strong coupling regime. The scale factor of its gauge coupling is determined from the matching, see (1.7),(2.8),

$$\overline{a}_{\,(+)}(\mu = \mu_q^{\rm pole}) = \left(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_q^{\rm pole}}\right)^{\nu_q} = \overline{a}_{\,YM}(\mu = \mu_q^{\rm pole}) = \Big(\frac{\mu_q^{\rm pole}}{\lambda_{YM}}\Big)^3 \quad \to$$

$$\to \quad \lambda_{YM} = \left(\Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c - N_F}\langle{\rm det}\,\frac{M}{\Lambda_Q}\rangle\right)^{1/3\overline{N}_c} = \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (QCD)}\rangle\,, \tag{2.10}$$

as it should be, see (2.1). After integrating out dual $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ gluons at $\mu < \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (QCD)}\rangle$ via the VY procedure [9, 10], the Lagrangian looks as

$$K = {\rm Tr}\Big[\,z_M(\Lambda_Q, \mu_q^{\rm pole})\,\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2}\,\Big]\,, \qquad \mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M + \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}\,, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert} = -\,\overline{N}_c\left(\Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c - N_F}\,{\rm det}\,\frac{M}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{1/\overline{N}_c}\,.$$

From (2.11)

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M) \sim \frac{1}{z_M(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_q^{\rm pole})}\,\frac{\Lambda_Q^2\langle S\rangle}{\langle M\rangle^2} \sim \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_F - 2N_c}{N_c}}\,, \quad \frac{\mu^{\rm pole}(M)}{\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (QCD)}\rangle} \sim \Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{2(N_F - 3N_c)}{3N_c}} \ll 1 \tag{2.12}$$

(the main contribution to $\mu^{\rm pole}(M)$ originates from $\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}$ in (2.11).

On the whole, the mass spectrum of the dual theory look in these QCD-vacua as follows. -

1) The mass of dual quarks is $\mu_q^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q$, i.e. $\mu_q^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q^{\rm pole}$ (but only up to parametric logarithmic factor), see (2.8) and section 2.1. All quarks are weakly confined, i.e. the tension of the confining string originating from $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ SYM is $\sqrt{\sigma} \sim \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (QCD)}\rangle \ll m_Q$.

2) There is a large number of strongly coupled gluonia, their mass scale is $\sim \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (QCD)}\rangle$.

3) Masses of N_F^2 mions M_j^i are $\mu^{\rm pole}(M) \sim \Lambda_Q(m_Q/\Lambda_Q)^{(N_F - 2N_c)/N_c} \ll \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (QCD)}\rangle$, see (2.12).

4) There are N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j with masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi$.

Comparing with the direct theory in section 2.1 it is seen that the mass spectra are parametrically different.

3 L vacua

There are $(N_F - 2N_c)$ quantum L - vacua at $\mu_\Phi \gg \mu_{\Phi,\rm o}$ with condensates, see Appendix,

$$\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L \equiv \langle \overline{Q}Q(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle_L \simeq \Lambda_Q^2 \left(\frac{N_c\,\mu_\Phi}{\overline{N}_c\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q^2\,, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}\rangle^3 \equiv \langle S\rangle_L = \Big(\frac{\det\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L}{\Lambda_Q^{3N_c-N_F}}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c} \simeq \Lambda_Q^3\Big(\frac{N_c\,\mu_\Phi}{\overline{N}_c\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_F}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q^3\,.$$

$$\langle m_Q^{\rm tot} = m_Q - \Phi\rangle_L = \frac{\langle S\rangle_L}{\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L} \simeq \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{N_c\,\mu_\Phi}{\overline{N}_c\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q\,,$$

$$\langle M\rangle_L \equiv \langle M(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle_L = \langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L\,, \quad \langle \overline{q}q\rangle = \frac{\Lambda_Q\langle S\rangle_L}{\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L} \simeq \Lambda_Q^2\Big(\frac{N_c\,\mu_\Phi}{\overline{N}_c\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q^2\,,$$

3.1 Direct theory

Because both $\langle m_Q^{\rm tot}\rangle_L \gg \Lambda_Q$ and $\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L \gg \Lambda_Q^2$, we have to deal in this case with the direct theory in the strong coupling regime $a(\mu \gg \Lambda_Q) \gg 1$. The potentially important masses look here as follows. The quark pole mass, see (1.4),(3.1),

$$m_Q^{\rm pole} = \frac{\langle m_Q^{\rm tot}\rangle_L}{z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\rm pole})} \simeq \Lambda_Q\left(\frac{N_c\,\mu_\Phi}{\overline{N}_c\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q\,, \tag{3.2}$$

$$z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\rm pole}) = \left(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q^{\rm pole}}\right)^{\gamma_Q}, \quad -1 < \gamma_Q = \frac{2N_c - N_F}{\overline{N}_c} < -\frac{1}{2}\,. \tag{3.3}$$

The gluon mass due to possible higgsing of quarks, see (1.4),

$$\Big(\mu_{gl}^{\rm pole}\Big)^2 \sim \left[a(\mu=\mu_{gl}^{\rm pole}) \sim \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_{gl}^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_Q}\right] z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\rm pole})\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L \sim \frac{\mu_{gl}^{\rm pole}}{\Lambda_Q}\,\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L\,,$$

$$\nu_Q = \frac{3N_c - 2N_F}{\overline{N}_c} = \gamma_Q - 1 < -1\,, \quad \mu_{gl}^{\rm pole} \sim \frac{\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L}{\Lambda_Q} \sim m_Q^{\rm pole} \sim \left(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q\,. \tag{3.4}$$

Because $N_F > 3N_c$ and the global flavor symmetry is unbroken in these L-vacua, the rank condition implies that quarks are not higgsed (as otherwise the flavor symmetry will be broken spontaneously), i.e. $m_Q^{\rm pole} = ({\rm several})\mu_{\rm gl}^{\rm pole}$, and so **the overall phase is HQ** (heavy quarks).

The running mass of Φ looks as, see (1.4),

$$\mu_\Phi(\mu \gg \Lambda_Q) = \frac{\mu_\Phi}{z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q,\mu)}\,, \quad z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q,\mu) = \Big(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\gamma_\Phi} \gg 1\,, \quad 1 < \gamma_\Phi = -2\gamma_Q < 2\,. \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, the running mass $\mu_\Phi(\mu)$ *decreases* with increasing $\mu > \Lambda_Q$ and (if nothing prevents) $\mu_\Phi(\mu > \mu_o^{\rm str}) < \mu$, so that the field Φ *becomes relevant* at scales $\mu > \mu_o^{\rm str}$, see section 4 in [11] and Appendix in [4],

$$\Lambda_Q \ll \mu_o^{str} = \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma_Q-1}} = \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{3N_F-5N_c}} \ll \mu_\Phi, \quad \frac{\mu_o^{str}}{m_Q^{\rm pole}} \sim \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c(2N_F-3N_c)}{(N_F-2N_c)(3N_F-5N_c)}} \ll 1\,. \quad (3.6)$$

Thus, when we are going down from high energy, because $\mu_o^{str} \ll \mu_\Phi \ll m_Q^{\rm pole}$, at the scale $\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole}$ where all quarks decouple as heavy, all fions are already relevant, i.e. their running mass $\mu_\Phi(\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole}) \ll \mu_\Phi \ll m_Q^{\rm pole}$. Because the RG evolution of all fions becomes frozen at $\mu < m_Q^{\rm pole}$, this means that there is no pole in propagators of fions at $\mu \sim \mu_\Phi$, the pole mass of all N_F^2 fions will be $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi(\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole}) \ll \mu_\Phi$, see (3.9) below.

All quarks decouple as heavy at $\mu < m_Q^{\rm pole}$ and there remains at this point the $SU(N_c)$ SYM in the strong coupling regime. The scale factor λ_{YM} of its gauge coupling is determined from the matching, see (1.4),(1.5),(3.2),

$$a_{(+)}(\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole}) = \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_Q} = a_{YM}(\mu = m_Q^{\rm pole}) = \Big(\frac{m_Q^{\rm pole}}{\lambda_{YM}}\Big)^3 \quad \to \quad \lambda_{YM} = \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}\rangle \ll m_Q^{\rm pole}\,, \quad (3.7)$$

as it should be, see (3.1). Decreasing scale further and integrating out gluons at $\mu < \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}\rangle$ via the VY procedure [9], the Lagrangian at $\mu = \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}\rangle$ looks as, see (1.1) for $\mathcal{W}_\Phi$,

$$K = z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\rm pole})\,{\rm Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\,, \quad z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\rm pole}) = \Big(\frac{m_Q^{\rm pole}}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\gamma_\Phi=-2\gamma_Q} \sim \frac{\mu_\Phi^2}{\Lambda_Q^2} \gg 1\,,$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_\Phi + N_c\Big(\Lambda_Q^{3N_c-N_F}\det m_Q^{\rm tot}\Big)^{1/N_c}\,, \quad m_Q^{\rm tot} = m_Q - \Phi\,. \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.8), the masses of all N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j are

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \frac{\mu_\Phi}{z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\rm pole})} \sim \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{\mu_\Phi} \ll \Lambda_Q \ll \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}\rangle \quad (3.9)$$

(both terms in the superpotential (3.8) give parametrically the same contributions).

Recall that there is no pole in the Φ-propagator at $\mu > \Lambda_Q$. There is only one generation of all N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j in this case with small masses (3.9).

3.2 Dual Theory

The dual $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ theory with $N_F > 3N_c$ quark flavors is UV free and logarithmically weakly coupled at scales $\mu > \Lambda_Q$. The potentially important masses look in these L-vacua as follows (ignoring below all logarithmic factors for simplicity). The masses of dual quarks, see (3.1),

$$\mu_q^{\rm pole} \sim \frac{\langle M\rangle_L}{\Lambda_Q} \sim \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \sim m_Q^{\rm pole} \gg \mu_\Phi \gg \langle\Lambda_{YM}^L\rangle \gg \Lambda_Q\,. \quad (3.10)$$

The masses of dual gluons due to possible higgsing of quarks

$$\overline{\mu}_{gl}^2 \sim \langle \overline{q} q \rangle \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q \,, \quad \frac{\overline{\mu}_{gl}}{\mu_q^{\rm pole}} \sim \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{2N_F-3N_c}{2(N_F-2N_c)}} \ll 1 \,. \tag{3.11}$$

Therefore, the dual quarks are not higgsed and **the overall phase is Hq** (heavy quarks). All dual quarks decouple as heavy at $\mu < \mu_q^{\rm pole}$ in the weak coupling regime and the weak logarithmic RG evolution of all N_F^2 mions M_j^i becomes frozen. All N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j have large masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$ and are irrelevant at $\mu \ll \mu_\Phi$.

Integrating out all dual quarks as heavy at $\mu < \mu_q^{\rm pole}$, then all fions Φ_i^j at $\mu < \mu_\Phi$, and finally all gluons at $\mu < \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)} \rangle$ via the VY procedure [9], the dual Lagrangian at $\mu = \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{L} \rangle \gg \Lambda_Q$ looks as, see (1.3) for $\mathcal{W}_M$,

$$K = {\rm Tr}\, \frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2} \,, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M + \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert} \,, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert} = -\overline{N}_c \Big(\Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c - N_F} \det \frac{M}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c} . \tag{3.12}$$

From (3.12), the masses of all all N_F^2 mions M_j^i are, see (3.1),

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M) \sim \frac{\Lambda_Q^2 \langle S \rangle_L}{\langle M \rangle_L^2} \sim \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{\mu_\Phi} \ll \Lambda_Q \tag{3.13}$$

(both terms of $\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter}$ in (3.12) give parametrically the same contributions).

The overall mass hierarchies look here as follows

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M) \ll \Lambda_Q \ll \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)} \rangle \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \ll \mu_q^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q^{\rm pole} \,. \tag{3.14}$$

At scales $\Lambda_Q^2/\mu_\Phi \ll \mu \ll \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)} \rangle$, there are only effectively massless N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j in the direct theory, see (3.9), and N_F^2 mions M_j^i in the dual one, see (3.13). Therefore, the t' Hooft triangles $SU^3(N_F)_L$ have opposite signs in the direct and dual theories.

Broken flavor symmetry $U(N_F) \to U(\mathrm{n}_1) \times U(\mathrm{n}_2)$

4 Lt vacua

4.1 Direct and dual theories

The quark condensates are parametrically the same as in L-vacua, see Appendix, the difference is that $\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1 \rangle_{\rm Lt} \neq \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2 \rangle_{\rm Lt}$,

$$\frac{N_c - \mathrm{n}_1}{N_c} \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1 \rangle_{\rm Lt} \simeq -\frac{N_c - \mathrm{n}_2}{N_c} \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2 \rangle_{\rm Lt} \sim \Lambda_Q^2 \left(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F - 2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q^2 \,. \tag{4.1}$$

Therefore, all nonzero masses are also parametrically the same, in particular all n_1^2 fions Φ_1^1, n_1^2 mions M_1^1, n_2^2 fions Φ_2^2, and n_2^2 mions M_2^2 have masses $\sim \Lambda_Q^2/\mu_\Phi \ll \Lambda_Q \ll \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}$, see (3.9),(3.13). The qualitative difference with the L-vacua is that the flavor symmetry is broken spontaneously and here appear massless Nambu-Goldstone particles. These are the hybrid fions Φ_2^1, Φ_1^2 in the direct theory, and hybrid mions M_2^1, M_1^2 in the dual one. Therefore, as in L-vacua, the t' Hooft triangles $SU^3(N_F)_L$ at scales $\mu < \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)} \rangle$ also have opposite signs in the direct and dual theories in these Lt-vacua.

5 Special vacua

5.1 Direct theory

The condensates look in these vacua with $\mathrm{n}_1 = N_c$, $\mathrm{n}_2 = \overline{N}_c$ as, see Appendix,

$$\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle = \frac{N_c}{2N_c - N_F} m_Q \mu_\Phi\,, \quad \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle = \Lambda_Q^2 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F - 2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q^2\,, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\mathrm{spec})}\rangle^3 \equiv \langle S\rangle = \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle}{\mu_\Phi} = m_Q \Lambda_Q^2 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F - 2N_c}}\,, \quad \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle} \sim \frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F - 2N_c}} \ll 1\,,$$

$$\langle m^{\mathrm{tot}}_{Q,2}\rangle = \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle}{\mu_\Phi} = \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F - 2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q\,, \quad \langle m^{\mathrm{tot}}_{Q,1}\rangle = \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle}{\mu_\Phi} \sim m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q\,.$$

Recall that this direct theory is logarithmically weakly coupled at scales $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$ only, while it is strongly coupled at $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$, $a(\mu \gg \Lambda_Q) \gg 1$. The potentially most important masses look in these vacua as follows. The quark mass looks as, see (1.4),

$$m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2} = \frac{\langle m^{\mathrm{tot}}_{Q,2}\rangle}{z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2})} = \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\langle m^{\mathrm{tot}}_{Q,2}\rangle}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_c}} \sim \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle}{\Lambda_Q},\; z_Q(\Lambda_Q,\mu) = \Big(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\gamma_Q},\; \gamma_Q = \frac{2N_c - N_F}{N_F - N_c} < 0. \tag{5.2}$$

The gluon mass due to possible higgsing of quarks looks as, see (1.4),(5.1),(5.2),

$$\Big(\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}\Big)^2 \sim a(\mu = \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1})\, z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}) \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle \sim \frac{\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}}{\Lambda_Q}\,\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle\,, \tag{5.3}$$

$$a(\mu = \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}) \sim \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}}\Big)^{\nu_Q}\,, \quad a(\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}) z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}) \sim \frac{\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}}{\Lambda_Q}\,, \quad \nu_Q = \gamma_Q - 1 = \frac{3N_c - 2N_F}{N_F - N_c} < 0,$$

$$\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1} \sim \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle}{\Lambda_Q} \equiv \frac{\langle\Pi_1\rangle}{\Lambda_Q} \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F - 2N_c}} \sim m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2} \gg \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q\,, \quad \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1} \gg \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,2}\,, \quad m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2} \gg m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,1}\,.$$

Therefore, **the overall phase is $\mathbf{HQ_2 - Higgs_1}$**. The whole RG evolution becomes frozen at $\mu < m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2} \sim \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1}$. Similarly to L-vacua in section 3.1, see (3.2),(3.5),(3.6), the running mass of all N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j is $\mu_\Phi(\mu = m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2}) \ll m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2}$, i.e. they are all relevant at scales $\mu < m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2}$ and there is no pole in the fion propagators at $\mu \sim \mu_\Phi$, all masses of fions are much smaller than μ_Φ, see below.

After integrating $Q^2, \overline{Q}_2$ quarks as heavy at $\mu \sim m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2}$, there remain $SU(N_c)$ SYM and $N'_F = N_c$ quarks $Q^1, \overline{Q}_1$ which are higgsed at the same scale: $\mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1} \sim \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2} \sim \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle/\Lambda_Q$, see (5.1). We use for this case with $N'_F = N_c$ the Lagrangian form proposed by Seiberg in [13].

As for the Kahler term, we write it as

$$K = \mathrm{Tr}\left[z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q, m^{\mathrm{pole}}_{Q,2})\,\Phi^\dagger\Phi + \frac{(\Pi^1_1)^\dagger \Pi^1_1}{\Lambda_Q^2}\right] + (B_1^\dagger B_1 + \overline{B}_1^{\,\dagger}\,\overline{B}_1)\,,\; \Pi^i_j = (\overline{Q}_j Q^i)\,,\; i,j = 1...N_c\,. \tag{5.4}$$

The kinetic term K_Π of $\mathrm{n}_1^2 = N_c^2$ pions Π^1_1 in (5.4) needs some explanations. There are two different contributions to K_Π. The first one originates directly from the kinetic term of higgsed quarks, see (5.2),(5.3),

$$K_Q = z^+_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1})\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[(Q^1_1)^\dagger Q^1_1 + (Q^1_1 \to \overline{Q}^{\,1}_1)\right] \to K^{(\mathrm{Born})}_\Pi \sim z^+_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\mathrm{pole}}_{gl,1})\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\sqrt{(\Pi^1_1)^\dagger \Pi^1_1}\,. \tag{5.5}$$

The second one originates from the loop of either massive gluons or massive higgsed quarks (superpartners of massive gluons) integrated over the non-parametric interval of momenta $p_E \sim \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,2}$. It looks parametrically as ($(\mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1})^2 \sim a_+(\mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1}) z^+_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1}) \sqrt{(\Pi^1_1)^\dagger \Pi^1_1}$, see (5.3), Q^1_1, $\overline{\mathsf{Q}}^1_1$ are canonically normalized quark fields):

$$K^{(\rm loop)}_\Pi \sim z^+_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1})\, {\rm Tr}\, \langle\langle\, (Q^1_1)^\dagger Q^1_1\, \rangle\rangle = {\rm Tr}\, \langle\langle\, (\mathsf{Q}^1_1)^\dagger \mathsf{Q}^1_1\, \rangle\rangle \sim {\rm Tr} \int \frac{d^4 p_E}{[\, p^2_E + (\mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1})^2\,]} \sim$$

$$\sim {\rm Tr}\, (\mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1})^2 \sim {\rm Tr} \Big[\, a_+(\mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1}) z^+_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1}) \sqrt{(\Pi^1_1)^\dagger \Pi^1_1}\, \Big] \,, \quad r = \frac{K^{(\rm loop)}_\Pi}{K^{(\rm Born)}_\Pi} \sim \ a_+(\mu = \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1})\,. \qquad (5.6)$$

So, $r \ll 1$ if quarks were higgsed in the weak coupling regime $a_+(\mu = \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1}) \ll 1$, but $r \gg 1$ in our case of the strong coupling regime $a_+(\mu = \mu^{\rm pole}_{gl,1}) \gg 1$. Therefore, see (5.3), $K_\Pi \simeq K^{(\rm loop)}_\Pi$ is as in (5.4).

As for the superpotential, we write it as

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_\Phi + {\rm Tr}\, (m^{\rm tot}_{Q,1} \Pi^1_1) - {\rm Tr} \Big(\Phi^2_1 \frac{\Pi^1_1}{m^{\rm tot}_{Q,2}} \Phi^1_2 \Big) + \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}\,,$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert} = A \bigg(1 - \frac{\langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,2} \rangle}{m^{\rm tot}_{Q,2}} \det\Big(\frac{\Pi^1_1}{\lambda^2}\Big) + \frac{\overline{B}_1 B_1}{\lambda^2} \bigg), \quad \lambda^2 = \langle (\overline{Q} Q)_1 \rangle = \langle \Pi_1 \rangle\,, \quad \langle A \rangle = \langle S \rangle\,. \qquad (5.7)$$

In (5.7): A is the Lagrange multiplier field, the additional factor $\langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,2} \rangle / m^{\rm tot}_{Q,2}$ in $\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}$ is needed to obtain from (5.7) the right value of $\langle \Phi_2 \rangle$, the third term in $\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter}$ originated from integrating out $\overline{N}^2_c$ heavy quarks $Q^2, \overline{Q}_2$.

We obtain from (5.4),(5.7):

a) the masses of $\overline{N}^2_c$ fions Φ^2_2 are, see (5.1),(5.2),

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi^2_2) \sim \frac{\mu_\Phi}{z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q, m^{\rm pole}_{Q,2})} \sim \frac{\Lambda^2_Q}{\mu_\Phi} \ll \Lambda_Q, \ \ z_\Phi(\Lambda_Q, m^{\rm pole}_{Q,2}) = \Big(\frac{m^{\rm pole}_{Q,2}}{\Lambda_Q} \Big)^{\gamma_\Phi} \sim \frac{\mu^2_\Phi}{\Lambda^2_Q}\,, \ \gamma_\Phi = -2\gamma_Q > 0\,, \ (5.8)$$

(the main contribution to $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi^2_2)$ originates from the term $\mathcal{W}_\Phi$ in (5.7), see (1.1) ;

b) N^2_c fields Π^1_1 and N^2_c fields Φ^1_1 are mixed significantly and physical fields $\widehat{\Pi}^1_1$, $\widehat{\Phi}^1_1$ have masses

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(\widehat{\Pi}^1_1) \sim \mu^{\rm pole}(\widehat{\Phi}^1_1) \sim \frac{\Lambda^2_Q}{\mu_\Phi} \ll \Lambda_Q\,; \qquad (5.9)$$

c) the baryons B_1, $\overline{B}_1$ have masses

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(B_1) = \mu^{\rm pole}(\overline{B}_1) \sim \frac{\langle S \rangle}{\langle (\overline{Q} Q)_1 \rangle} = \langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,1} \rangle \sim m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q\,; \qquad (5.10)$$

d) $2{\rm n}_1{\rm n}_2$ hybrid fions Φ^1_2, Φ^2_1 are the Nambu-Goldstone particles and are massless.

5.2 Dual Theory

This $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ theory is UV free at $N_F > 3N_c$ and weakly coupled at $\mu > \Lambda_Q$, but it is strongly coupled at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$. The potentially most important masses look here as (ignoring all logarithmic factors for simplicity), see (5.1),

$$\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole} \sim \mu_{q,1} \equiv \mu_{q,1}(\mu = \Lambda_Q) \sim \frac{\langle M_1 \rangle = \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1 \rangle}{\Lambda_Q} \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F - 2N_c}} \gg \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q \,, \tag{5.11}$$

$$\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \langle (\overline{q}q)_2 \rangle^{1/2} = \Big(\Lambda_Q \langle m_{Q,2}^{\rm tot} \rangle\Big)^{1/2} \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{2(N_F - 2N_c)}} \,, \quad \Lambda_Q \ll \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole} \,,$$

$$\mu_{q,2} \sim \frac{m_Q \mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q} \,, \quad \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \mu_{q,2} \quad {\rm at} \;\; m_Q \mu_\Phi > \Lambda_Q^2, \quad \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{m_Q \mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q^2}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{\overline{N}_c}} \quad {\rm at} \;\; m_Q \mu_\Phi < \Lambda_Q^2.$$

$$\frac{\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}}{\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}} \ll 1 \quad {\rm at} \quad \frac{m_Q \mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q^2} < 1, \qquad \frac{\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}}{\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}} \sim \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\widehat{\mu}_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{2N_F - 5N_c}{2(N_F - 2N_c)}} \quad {\rm at} \quad \frac{m_Q \mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q^2} > 1, \tag{5.12}$$

$$\widehat{\mu}_\Phi = \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q}\Big)^{\frac{2(N_F - 2N_c)}{2N_F - 5N_c}} \gg \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{m_Q}.$$

As it is seen from (5.12), the hierarchy $\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \lessgtr \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}$ changes at $\mu_\Phi \lessgtr \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$. As a result, **the overall phase changes also**: it is $\mathbf{Hq_1 - Higgs_2}$ at $\mu_\Phi < \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$ and $\mathbf{Hq_1 - Hq_2}$ at $\mu_\Phi > \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$.

A). Consider first the region $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$. The dual quarks $q_1, \overline{q}^1$ decouple as heavy in the weak coupling regime at $\mu = \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole} \gg \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$ and there remains $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ with ${\rm n}_2 = \overline{N}_c$ flavors of quarks $q_2, \overline{q}^2$. The new scale factor of the gauge coupling is

$$\Big(\widehat{\Lambda}\Big)^{3\overline{N}_c - {\rm n}_2 = 2\overline{N}_c} = \Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c - N_F} \mu_{q,1}^{N_c} \,, \quad \widehat{\Lambda} \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{2(N_F - 2N_c)}} \sim \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \gg \Lambda_Q. \tag{5.13}$$

After integrating out $q_1, \overline{q}^1$ quarks as heavy at $\mu < \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}$ and then all N_F^2 fions Φ at $\mu < \mu^{\,\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi \gg \widehat{\Lambda}$, the dual Lagrangian looks as (all logarithmic factors in the Kahler term are ignored for simplicity), see (1.3) for $\mathcal{W}_M$,

$$K = {\rm Tr}\Big[\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2} + (q_2)^\dagger q_2 + (q_2 \to \overline{q}^2)\Big] \,,$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M + {\rm Tr}\left(\overline{q}^2 M_2^1 \frac{1}{\Lambda_Q M_1^1} M_1^2 q_2\right) - {\rm Tr}\left(\overline{q}^2 \frac{M_2^2}{\Lambda_Q} q_2\right), \tag{5.14}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_M = m_Q {\rm Tr}\,(M) - \frac{1}{2\mu_\Phi}\left({\rm Tr}(M^2) - \frac{1}{N_c}({\rm Tr}M)^2\right).$$

All $\overline{N}_c$ flavors of quarks $q_2, \overline{q}^2$ are higgsed at $\mu \sim \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \widehat{\Lambda} \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}$ (already in the strong coupling region $\overline{a}(\mu \sim \widehat{\Lambda}) \sim 1$), and we use for this case with $N_F' = {\rm n}_2 = \overline{N}_c$ the form of $\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}$ proposed in [13],

$$K = {\rm Tr}\Big[\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2} + 2\sqrt{(N_2^2)^\dagger N_2^2}\Big] + \Big(B_2^\dagger B_2 + (B_2 \to \overline{B}_2)\Big) \,, \quad N_i^j = (\overline{q}^j q_i) \,, \; i,j = N_c + 1 ... N_F \,,$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M - {\rm Tr}\ \frac{M_2^2 N_2^2}{\Lambda_Q} + {\rm Tr}\ \left(M_2^1 \frac{N_2^2}{\Lambda_Q M_1^1} M_1^2 \right) + \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}\,, \tag{5.15}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert} = \overline{A}\left(1 - \det\Big(\frac{N_2^2}{\langle N_2\rangle}\Big) + \frac{\overline{B}_2 B_2}{\langle N_2\rangle}\right),\ \langle \overline{A}\rangle = \langle \overline{S}\rangle = \langle -S\rangle,\ \langle N_2\rangle \sim (\widehat{\Lambda})^2 \sim \Lambda_Q^2 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \tag{5.16}$$

where $\overline{A}$ is the Lagrange multiplier field and N_2^2 are $\overline{N}_c^{\,2}$ dual pions (nions).

We obtain from (5.15),(5.16) for the particle masses:

a) $\overline{N}_c^{\,2}$ fields M_2^2 and $\overline{N}_c^{\,2}$ fields N_2^2 have masses

$$\Lambda_Q \ll \mu^{\,\rm pole}(M_2^2) \sim \mu^{\,\rm pole}(N_2^2) \sim \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \Lambda_Q \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{2(N_F-2N_c)}} \ll \mu_\Phi\,, \tag{5.17}$$

(the main contribution originates from the second term in the superpotential (5.15)),

b) the masses of baryons are

$$\mu^{\,\rm pole}(B_2) = \mu^{\,\rm pole}(\overline{B}_2) \sim \frac{\langle M_2\rangle}{\Lambda_Q} \sim \frac{m_Q \mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q} \ll \mu^{\,\rm pole}(M_2^2)\,, \tag{5.18}$$

c) N_c^2 mions M_1^1 have masses

$$\mu^{\,\rm pole}(M_1^1) \sim \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{\mu_\Phi} \ll \Lambda_Q\,, \tag{5.19}$$

d) $2{\rm n}_1{\rm n}_2 = 2\overline{N}_c N_c$ hybrid mions M_2^1, M_1^2 are the Nambu-Goldstone particles and are massless.

The hierarchies of nonzero masses look in this region $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$ as

$$\mu^{\,\rm pole}(M_1^1) \ll \Lambda_Q \ll \mu^{\,\rm pole}(M_2^2) \sim \mu^{\,\rm pole}(N_2^2) \sim \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}\,, \quad \mu^{\,\rm pole}(M_1^1) \lesseqgtr \mu^{\,\rm pole}(B_2)\,. \tag{5.20}$$

B) The region $\mu_\Phi \gg \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$. The Lagrangian (5.14) remains the same, the difference at lower energies is that quarks $\overline{q}^2, q_2$ are not higgsed now but decouple as heavy at $\mu < \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q\mu_\Phi/\Lambda_Q$, $\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \gg \widehat{\Lambda}$, still in the weak coupling regime, see (5.12),(5.13). The scale factor of the gauge coupling of remained unbroken $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ SYM at $\mu < \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}$ looks as, see (5.1),

$$\lambda_{YM}^{3\overline{N}_c} = \Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c - N_F} \mu_{q,1}^{N_c}\, \mu_{q,2}^{\overline{N}_c}\,, \quad \lambda_{YM}^3 = m_Q \Lambda_Q^2 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}} = \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm spec)}\rangle^3\,, \tag{5.21}$$

as it should be. The hierarchies of scales look as: $\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole} \gg \mu_\Phi \gg \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \gg \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm spec)}\rangle \gg \Lambda_Q$. All N_F^2 fion fields Φ with masses $\mu^{\,\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi$ can also be integrated out at scales $\mu < \mu_\Phi$. Therefore, after integrating out all quarks and all Φ as heavy and, finally, $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ gluons at $\mu = \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm spec)}\rangle$ via the VY procedure [9], the Lagrangian looks as, see (5.14) for $\mathcal{W}_M$,

$$K = {\rm Tr}\,\frac{M^\dagger M}{\Lambda_Q^2}\,, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\rm matter} = \mathcal{W}_M + \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}\,, \quad \mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert} = -\overline{N}_c \Big(\Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c - N_F} \det \frac{M}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c}\,. \tag{5.22}$$

From (5.22), the masses of N_c^2 mions M_1^1 and $\overline{N}_c^{\,2}$ mions M_2^2 are (up to logarithmic factors), see (5.1),

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1) \sim \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{\mu_\Phi} \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2) \sim \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle}\frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{\mu_\Phi} \sim \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{m_Q}\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{N_F-3N_c}{N_F-2N_c}} \ll \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm spec)}\rangle\,, \quad \mu_\Phi \gg \widehat{\mu}_\Phi\,, \quad (5.23)$$

(the main contribution to $\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1)$ in (5.23) originates from $\mathcal{W}_M$, while $\mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2)$ is dominated by the contribution from $\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}$).

$2\overline{N}_cN_c$ hybrid mions M_2^1, M_1^2 are the Numbu-Goldstone particles and are massless.

The hierarchies of nonzero masses look in this region $\mu_\Phi \gg \widehat{\mu}_\Phi$ as

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1) \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2) \ll \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm spec)}\rangle \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}\,. \quad (5.24)$$

6 br1 vacua, $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \Lambda_Q^2/m_Q$

6.1 Direct theory

The condensates look in these vacua with $\mathrm{n}_1 < N_c, \mathrm{n}_2 > \overline{N}_c$ as, see Appendix,

$$\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1} \simeq \frac{N_c}{N_c-\mathrm{n}_1}m_Q\mu_\Phi, \quad \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1} \sim \Lambda_Q^2\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{\mathrm{n}_1}{N_c-\mathrm{n}_1}}\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\mathrm{n}_2-N_c}{N_c-\mathrm{n}_1}}, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}\rangle^3 \equiv \langle S\rangle_{\rm br1} \sim \Lambda_Q^3\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{\mathrm{n}_1}{N_c-\mathrm{n}_1}}\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\mathrm{n}_2-\mathrm{n}_1}{N_c-\mathrm{n}_1}}, \quad \frac{\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}}{m_Q} \ll 1\,, \quad \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1}}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}} \ll 1\,.$$

This direct $SU(N_c)$ theory is in the weak coupling IR free logarithmic regime at scales $\mu < \Lambda_Q$. We consider in this section 6 only the region $m_Q\mu_\Phi \ll \Lambda_Q^2$.

All N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j have masses $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_o^{\rm str} \ll \mu_\Phi$, see section 2.1 and (2.4), and become too heavy and irrelevant at $\mu < \mu_o^{\rm str}$. Therefore, they all can be integrated out as heavy at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$, but it is technically more convenient to retain them all as irrelevant auxiliary fields.

The largest masses smaller than Λ_Q have $\mathrm{n}_1(2N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ gluons due to higgsing of $Q^1, \overline{Q}_1$ quarks (all logarithmic factors are ignored for simplicity)

$$\mu_{gl,1}^{\rm pole} \sim \langle\Pi_1\rangle^{1/2} = \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}^{1/2} \sim (m_Q\mu_\Phi)^{1/2} \ll \Lambda_Q\,. \quad (6.2)$$

At scales $\mu < \mu_{gl,1}^{\rm pole}$ there remain $SU(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ gauge group, $2\mathrm{n}_2(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ still active quarks $\overline{Q}_2', Q'^{,2}$ with unbroken colors, $2\mathrm{n}_1\mathrm{n}_2$ hybrid pions $\Pi_2^1 = \overline{Q}_2\langle Q^1\rangle$, $\Pi_1^2 = \langle\overline{Q}_1\rangle Q^2$ (in essence, these are quarks $Q^2, \overline{Q}_2$ with broken colors), and n_1^2 pions Π_1^1.

The next mass scale $m_{Q,2}^{\rm pole} \ll \mu_{gl,1}$ is those of $\overline{Q}_2', Q'^{,2}$ quarks

$$m_{Q,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \langle m_{Q,2}^{\rm tot}\rangle \sim m_Q \gg \mu_{gl,2}^{\rm pole} \sim \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1}^{1/2}\,, \quad m_{Q,2}^{\rm tot} = m_Q - \Phi_2^2\,. \quad (6.3)$$

Therefore, **the overall phase is Higgs$_1$ − HQ$_2$**. After integrating out all higgsed quarks and gluons at $\mu < \mu_{gl,1}^{\rm pole}$ and then $\overline{Q}_2', Q'^{,2}$ quarks as heavy at $\mu < m_{Q,2}^{\rm pole}$, the scale factor λ_{YM} of the $SU(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ SYM is, see (6.1),

$$\lambda_{YM}^{3(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)} = \frac{\Lambda_Q^{3N_c-N_F}\langle m_{Q,2}^{\rm tot}\rangle^{\mathrm{n}_2}}{\langle\det\Pi_1^1\rangle} \quad \to \quad \lambda_{YM} = \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}\rangle\,, \quad (6.4)$$

as it should be. Integrating then out $SU(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ gluons via the VY procedure [9], the Lagrangian at $\mu=\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm br1}\rangle$ looks as, see (1.1) for $\mathcal{W}_\Phi$,

$$K=\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)+\mathrm{Tr}\left[2\sqrt{(\Pi_1^1)^\dagger\Pi_1^1}+\Pi_2^1\frac{1}{\sqrt{(\Pi_1^1)^\dagger\Pi_1^1}}\,(\Pi_2^1)^\dagger+(\Pi_1^2)^\dagger\frac{1}{\sqrt{(\Pi_1^1)^\dagger\Pi_1^1}}\,\Pi_1^2\right], \tag{6.5}$$

$$\mathcal{W}=\mathcal{W}_\Phi+\mathrm{Tr}\left(m_{Q,1}^{\rm tot}\,\Pi_1^1\right)+\mathcal{W}_{\rm hybr}+\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}\,,\quad \mathcal{W}_{\rm hybr}=\mathrm{Tr}\left(\Pi_2^1\frac{m_{Q,2}^{\rm tot}}{\Pi_1^1}\Pi_1^2-\Phi_1^2\Pi_2^1-\Phi_2^1\Pi_1^2\right),$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}=(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)\Big(\,\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (br1)}\Big)^3=(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)\left[\frac{\Lambda_Q^{3N_c-N_F}\,\det m_{Q,2}^{\rm tot}}{\det\Pi_1^1}\right]^{1/(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)}.$$

The masses of n_1^2 pions Π_1^1 and $2\mathrm{n}_1\mathrm{n}_2$ hybrids from (6.5) are

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(\Pi_1^1)\sim\frac{\langle\Pi_1^1\rangle=\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}}{\mu_\Phi}\sim m_Q\sim m_{Q,2}^{\rm pole}\,,\quad \langle\Pi_{1'}^1\rangle=\langle(\overline{Q}_{1'}Q^1)\rangle_{\rm br1}=\delta_{1'}^1\frac{N_c}{N_c-\mathrm{n}_1}\,m_Q\mu_\Phi\,, \tag{6.6}$$

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(\Pi_2^1)=\mu^{\rm pole}(\Pi_1^2)=0\,,$$

(the main contribution to $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Pi_1^1)$ gives the term $\sim(\Pi_1^1)^2/\mu_\Phi$ originating from $\mathrm{Tr}\,(m_{Q,1}^{\rm tot}\,\Pi_1^1)$ in (6.5) after integrating out heavy Φ_1^1 with masses $\gg\Lambda_Q$).

On the whole, the mass spectrum of this $\mathcal{N}=1$ $SU(N_c)$ theory look in this case as follows.
1) There are $\mathrm{n}_1(2N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ $\mathcal{N}=1$ multiplets of massive gluons, $\mu_{\rm gl,1}^{\rm pole}\sim(m_Q\mu_\Phi)^{1/2}\ll\Lambda_Q$.
2) A large number of hadrons made from nonrelativistic and weakly confined $\overline{Q}_2'$, $Q^{2,\prime}$ quarks with $\mathrm{n}_2>N_c$ flavors and $N_c-\mathrm{n}_1$ colors, their mass scale is $\mu_H\sim m_Q$, $\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (br1)}\rangle\ll\mu_H\ll\mu_{\rm gl,1}$ (the tension of the confining string originating from $SU(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ SYM is $\sigma^{1/2}\sim\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (br1)}\rangle\ll m_Q$).
3) n_1^2 pions Π_1^1 with masses $\sim m_Q$.
4) A large number of $\mathcal{N}=1$ $SU(N_c-\mathrm{n}_1)$ SYM strongly coupled gluonia with the mass scale $\sim\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (br1)}\rangle$, see (6.1).
5) $2\mathrm{n}_1\mathrm{n}_2$ massless Nambu-Goldstone $\mathcal{N}=1$ multiplets Π_2^1, Π_1^2.
6) All N_F^2 fields Φ have masses $\Lambda_Q\ll\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi)\sim\mu_o^{\rm str}\ll\mu_\Phi$, see (2.4), and are dynamically irrelevant at lower scales.

6.2 Dual Theory

The condensates in this dual theory (1.2) at the scale $\mu=\Lambda_Q$ look as, see (6.1),

$$\langle M_i\rangle=\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_i\rangle,\ i=1,2,\quad \langle(\overline{q}q)_2\rangle=\frac{\Lambda_Q\langle M_1\rangle}{\mu_\Phi}\sim m_Q\Lambda_Q\,,\quad \frac{\langle(\overline{q}q)_1\rangle}{\langle(\overline{q}q)_2\rangle}=\frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle}\ll 1\,. \tag{6.7}$$

Recall that we consider only the region $m_Q\mu_\Phi\ll\Lambda_Q^2$ and this dual theory is strongly coupled at scales $\mu<\Lambda_Q$. All masses of dual quarks and gluons are $\ll\Lambda_Q$ in this case, so that we have to deal with the strong coupling regime of this theory, $\overline{a}(\mu\ll\Lambda_Q)=(\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_q>0}\gg 1$. All N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j have masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi)\sim\mu_\Phi\gg\Lambda_Q$, they are too heavy and dynamically irrelevant at $\mu<\mu_\Phi$. Therefore, they all can be integrated out from the beginning, see (1.3). The potentially important masses look

as follows:
a) the masses of dual quarks

$$\mu_{q,1}\equiv\mu_{q,1}(\mu=\Lambda_Q)=\frac{\langle M_1\rangle}{\Lambda_Q}\sim\frac{m_Q\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\,,\ \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}=\frac{\mu_{q,1}}{z_q^{(+)}(\Lambda_Q,\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})}\sim\Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{m_Q\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q^2}\Big)^{N_c/\overline{N}_c}\ll\Lambda_Q\,,\quad(6.8)$$

$$\mu_{q,2}=\frac{\langle M_2\rangle}{\Lambda_Q},\quad \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}=\frac{\mu_{q,2}}{z_q^{(+)}(\Lambda_Q,\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})z_q^{(-)}(\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole},\,\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole})}\sim m_Q\ll\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole},\ z_q^{(\pm)}(\mu_1,\mu_2)=\Big(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\Big)^{\gamma_q^{(\pm)}}\quad(6.9)$$

$$\gamma_q^{(+)}=\frac{N_F-2N_c}{N_c}\,,\ \nu_q^{(+)}=\frac{N_F-3N_c}{N_c},\ \gamma_q^{(-)}=\frac{N_F-2N_c+{\rm n}_1}{N_c-{\rm n}_1}\,,\ \nu_q^{(-)}=\frac{N_F-3N_c+2{\rm n}_1}{N_c-{\rm n}_1}\,,\quad\gamma_\Phi=0\,;$$

b) the gluon masses due to possible higgsing of dual quarks, see (6.7)-(6.9),

$$\Big(\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}\Big)^2\sim\rho^{(+)}\rho^{(-)}\,\langle(\overline{q}q)_2\rangle\sim\frac{\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}}{\Lambda_Q}\,\langle(\overline{q}q)_2\rangle,\ \overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}\sim m_Q\gg\overline{\mu}_{gl,1}^{\rm pole},\ \overline{a}(\mu=\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})\sim\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_q^{(+)}}\quad(6.10)$$

$$\rho^{(+)}=\overline{a}(\mu=\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})\,z_q^{(+)}(\Lambda_Q,\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})\sim\frac{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}}{\Lambda_Q}\,,\quad\rho^{(-)}\sim\Big(\frac{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}}{\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_q^{(-)}}\,z_q^{(-)}(\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole},\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole})\sim\frac{\overline{\mu}_{gl,2}^{\rm pole}}{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}}\,.$$

Because ${\rm n}_1<N_c,{\rm n}_2>\overline{N}_c$ in these br1-vacua and the flavor symmetry is broken as $U(N_F)\to U({\rm n}_1)\times U({\rm n}_2)$, the rank condition implies that quarks $q_2,\overline{q}^2$ are not higgsed (as otherwise the flavor symmetry $U({\rm n}_2)$ will be *additionally* broken), i.e. $\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}=$ (several)$\,\overline{\mu}_{\rm gl,2}^{\rm pole}$. Therefore, **the overall phase is $\mathbf{Hq_1-Hq_2}$** (heavy quarks).

Integrating then out $q_1,\overline{q}^1$ quarks as heavy at $\mu<\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}$, and then $q_2,\overline{q}^2$ at $\mu=\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}$, the scale factor of the remained $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ SYM in the strong coupling regime is determined from the matching, see (1.4),(1.5),(6.8),(6.9),

$$\overline{a}(\mu=\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole})=\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_q^{(+)}}\Big(\frac{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}}{\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}}\Big)^{\nu_q^{(-)}}=\overline{a}_{YM}(\mu=\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole})=\Big(\frac{\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole}}{\lambda_{YM}}\Big)^3\quad\to\quad\lambda_{YM}=\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (br1)}\rangle\,,\quad(6.11)$$

as it should be, see (6.1). Finally, integrating at $\mu<\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{\rm (br1)}\rangle$ all $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ gluons via the VY procedure [9], the Lagrangian takes the form, see (6.9),

$$K=\frac{z_M^{(+)}(\Lambda_Q,\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})}{\Lambda_Q^2}\,{\rm Tr}\,\Big[\,(M_1^1)^\dagger M_1^1+(M_2^1)^\dagger M_2^1+(M_1^2)^\dagger M_1^2+z_M^{(-)}(\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole},\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole})(M_2^2)^\dagger M_2^2\Big]\,,\quad(6.12)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm matter}=\mathcal{W}_M+\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}\,,\quad\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}=-\overline{N}_c\Big(\Lambda_Q^{3\overline{N}_c-N_F}\,\det\frac{M}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c}\,,\qquad(6.13)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_M=m_Q{\rm Tr}\,(M)-\frac{1}{2\mu_\Phi}\Big[{\rm Tr}\,(M^2)-\frac{1}{N_c}\Big({\rm Tr}\,M\Big)^2\Big]\,,\ z_M^{(\pm)}(\mu_1,\mu_2)=\Big(\frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1}\Big)^{\gamma_M^{(\pm)}}\,,\ \gamma_M^{(\pm)}=-2\gamma_q^{(\pm)}\,,(6.14)$$

see Appendix in [4].

We obtain from (6.12),(6.13),(6.14) for the masses of N_F^2 mions M_j^i:
a) masses of N_c^2 mions M_1^1

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1) \simeq \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{z_M^{(+)}(\Lambda_Q,\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})\mu_\Phi} \sim \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{2(N_F-2N_c)/\overline{N}_c}\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{(N_F-3N_c)/\overline{N}_c} \ll m_Q \text{ at } \mu_\Phi \ll \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{m_Q}\,,$$

$$\frac{\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1)}{\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}} \sim \left[\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_F-4N_c}{2N_F-5N_c}}\right]^{(2N_F-5N_c)/\overline{N}_c} \ll 1 \quad \text{at} \quad \mu_\Phi \ll \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{m_Q}\,, \quad \overline{N}_c = N_F - N_c\,, \qquad (6.15)$$

the main contribution to $\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1)$ originates from the term $\sim (M_1^1)^2/\mu_\Phi$ in (6.14);
b) masses of $\overline{N}_c^2$ mions M_2^2

$$\mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2) \simeq \frac{\langle M_1\rangle}{\langle M_2\rangle}\frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{z_M^{(+)}(\Lambda_Q,\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole})z_M^{(-)}(\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole},\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole})\mu_\Phi} \sim \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_F-2N_c}{N_c-{\rm n}_1}}\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{{\rm n}_1}{N_c-{\rm n}_1}} \ll \mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1)\,,$$

$$\Big[\frac{\mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2)}{\langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}\rangle}\Big]^3 \sim \Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{2(N_F-3N_c+{\rm n}_1)}{N_c-{\rm n}_1}}\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{2{\rm n}_1}{N_c-{\rm n}_1}} \ll 1\,, \qquad (6.16)$$

the main contribution to $\mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2)$ originates from the term $\mathcal{W}_{\rm non-pert}$ in (6.13).

On the whole, the mass spectrum of this $\mathcal{N}=1$ $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ dual theory at $\mu_\Phi \ll \Lambda_Q^2/m_Q$ look in this case as follows. All quarks are not higgsed but weakly confined.
1) Among the masses smaller than Λ_Q the largest masses have $q_1, \overline{q}^1$ quarks,
$\mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole} \sim \Lambda_Q(m_Q\mu_\Phi/\Lambda_Q^2)^{N_c/\overline{N}_c} \ll \Lambda_Q$, see (6.8).
2) The next mass scale is those of $q_2, \overline{q}^2$ quarks, $\mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \sim m_Q \ll \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}$, see (6.9).
3) There is a large number of strongly coupled gluonia from $SU(\overline{N}_c)$ SYM, the scale of their masses is $\sim \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}\rangle \ll m_Q$, see (6.1), the tension of the confining string is $\sigma^{1/2} \sim \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}\rangle \ll \mu_{q,2}^{\rm pole} \ll \mu_{q,1}^{\rm pole}$.
4) There are ${\rm n}_1^2$ mions M_1^1 with masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(M_1^1) \ll m_Q$, see (6.15).
5) There are ${\rm n}_2^2$ mions M_2^2 with masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(M_2^2) \ll \langle\Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br1)}\rangle$, see (6.16).
6) There are $2{\rm n}_1{\rm n}_1$ massless Nambu-Goldstone multiplets of M_2^1 and M_1^2.
7) All N_F^2 fions Φ_i^j have masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \sim \mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$.

Comparing the mass spectra of the direct theory in section 6.1 and dual one in this section in these br1-vacua it is seen that they are parametrically different.

7 Conclusions

This paper finishes our study in [11, 17, 4, 1] of $\mathcal{N}=1$ SQCD-like theories (and their Seiberg's dual) with N_F^2 additional colorless but flavored scalar multiplets Φ_i^j, with the large mass parameter $\mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$. Therefore, we enumerate in these conclusions in a very short form only the main characteristic properties of such $\mathcal{N}=1$ SUSY theories which have been found out in these studies.

I) The effective superpotential, see (A.3), was proposed in section 3 of [11] which accounts for all anomalies and depends only on quark bilinear combinations $\Pi_j^i = (\overline{Q}_j Q^i)$. Together with (A.2)

and Konishi anomalies [12], see (A.1), it allowed to calculate the values of gluino condensates and condensates of direct and dual quarks in numerous vacua of these theories, as well as multiplicities of these vacua, at different values of N_F and in different regions of μ_Φ/Λ_Q: a) at $1 \le N_F < 2N_c$ in section 3 of [11], b) at $N_F > 2N_c$ in section 2 of [4]. It appeared that the results in three different regions, $1 < N_F < N_c$, $N_c < N_F < 2N_c$, $2N_c < N_F < 3N_c$ are different, in general, and are not analytic continuation of each other. It was shown that the explicit dependence of various condensates on $(m_Q/\Lambda_Q) \ll 1$ and $(\mu_\Phi/\Lambda_Q) \gg 1$, as well as multiplicities of various vacua, are qualitatively different in two regions: 1) $\Lambda_Q \ll \mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{\Phi,o} = \Lambda_Q(\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{(2N_c-N_F)/N_c}$, 2) $\mu_\Phi \gg \mu_{\Phi,o}$, and the nontrivial evolutions of all condensates in different vacua at $\mu_\Phi \lesseqgtr \mu_{\Phi,o}$ were traced.

II) A new nontrivial phenomenon was discovered in the direct theory in the strongly coupled regimes. 1) Due to the strong powerlike RG evolution at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ with $N_c + 1 < N_F < 3N_c$, the seemingly heavy and dynamically irrelevant at scales $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ colorless fields Φ_i^j with $\mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$ can really become light and relevant, and there appear then two additional generations of light Φ-particles with masses $\mu^{\rm pole}(\Phi) \ll \Lambda_Q$. This was described in detail in section 4 of [11], and in [17, 4, 1] in different vacua of direct theories in strongly coupled or conformal regimes. 2) At $\mu > \Lambda_Q$ with $N_F > 3N_c$ in the direct theory, for the same reasons, the seemingly heavy and dynamically irrelevant fields Φ_i^j can become very light and even massless, as described in this paper.

III) The mass spectra in the direct theories with $SU(N_c)$ colors and in their Seiberg's dual ones with $SU(N_F - N_c)$ colors were calculated, on the whole, in [11, 17, 1] in all different vacua at $N_F \lesseqgtr 2N_c$ and $\mu_\Phi \lesseqgtr \mu_{\Phi,o}$, and in [4] and this paper at $N_F > 2N_c$ and $\mu_{\Phi,o} \ll \Lambda_Q \ll \mu_\Phi$.

At $1 < N_F < N_c$ all quark masses and a part of gluon masses (except for those in remaining unbroken at scales $\mu > \Lambda_{YM}$ SYM subgroup) in the direct $SU(N_c)$ theory are $\gg \Lambda_Q$, i.e. in the region where the theory is weakly coupled. Therefore, the calculations of mass spectra in this case are straightforward and there is no need for additional assumptions about the dynamics.

At $N_F > N_c$ either direct or dual theories are strongly coupled in most vacua. Therefore, at present, to calculate mass spectra in the strong coupling regime, one has to introduce some assumptions about the dynamics of such $\mathcal{N} = 1$ theories. Calculations were performed in [17, 4, 1] and in this paper in the framework of the dynamical scenario introduced in [8] for the ordinary $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD (i.e. without additional fields Φ_i^j, but with quarks of different masses). This scenario assumes that quarks in such $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theories can be in two *standard* phases only: these are either the HQ (heavy quark) phase where they are confined, or the Higgs phase where they form nonzero coherent condensate breaking the color symmetry. The word *standard* implies here also that, in such theories without elementary colored adjoint scalars, no additional parametrically lighter solitons (e.g. magnetic monopoles or dyons) are formed at those scales where quarks decouple as heavy or are higgsed (see also the footnote 2).

The calculations of mass spectra of SQCD-like theories (1.1),(1.2) were performed in the framework of this scenario in: [17] for $3N_c/2 < N_F < 2N_c$, in [4] for $2N_c < N_F < 3N_c$, in [1] for $N_c + 1 < N_F < 3N_c/2$, and in this paper for $N_F > 3N_c$. Recall that at $3N_c/2 < N_F < 3N_c$ both direct and dual theories considered in [17, 4] enter at $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ the strongly coupled conformal regime (except for the parametrically narrow end regions). At $N_c + 1 < N_F < 3N_c/2$ and $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$ the direct theories are in the (very) strongly coupled regime with the gauge coupling $a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim (\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_Q > 0} \gg 1$, while dual theories are in the logarithmically weakly coupled regime with the dual gauge coupling $\overline{a}(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim 1/\log(\Lambda_Q/\mu) \ll 1$. Vice versa, at $N_F > 3N_c$ the dual theories are logarithmically weakly coupled at $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$ and (very) strongly coupled at $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$, with the dual gauge coupling

$\overline{a}(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim (\Lambda_Q/\mu)^{\nu_q > 0} \gg 1$, while the direct theories are (very) strongly coupled at $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$ and logarithmically weakly coupled at $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$.

For these reasons, the mass spectra, in given theory and in a given vacuum, are parametrically different in different regions of N_F, as well as at $\mu_\Phi \lessgtr \mu_{\Phi,\mathrm{o}}$. Besides, they are parametrically different in numerous different vacua. All these mass spectra were calculated and described in detail for both direct and dual theories in [17, 4, 1] and in this paper for the whole region $N_F > N_c + 1$.

In each given vacuum, comparison of mass spectra of direct theories and their Seiberg's dual ones showed that they are *parametrically different*. In connection with this we note that, as it is seen from [8] for the ordinary $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD and in [17, 4, 1] for SQCD-like theories with additional N_F^2 colorless scalar multiplets Φ_i^j, all results obtained within the assumed dynamical scenario from [8] look self-consistent. Moreover, it is worth to recall that this dynamical scenario satisfies all those tests which were used as checks of the Seiberg hypothesis about the equivalence of the direct and dual theories. These parametrical differences of mass spectra of direct and dual theories show, in particular, that all these tests, although necessary, may well be insufficient.

IV) In section 8 of [4] were traced also close relations of these $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theories with the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SQCD. Namely, with corresponding matching of parameters, all gluino and quark condensates in each vacuum, as well as multiplicities of various vacua, in these $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theories with N_F^2 additional colorless scalars Φ_i^j with $\mu_\Phi \gg \Lambda_Q$ are the same as in the broken $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SQCD with the mass parameter μ_x of adjoint colored scalars. Besides, the equality of mass spectra in br2 and S-vacua of softly broken $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SQCD with $m \ll \mu_\mathrm{x} \ll \Lambda_2$ and in corresponding (with especially chosen parameters) Seiberg's dual variant of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD-like theory with N_F^2 additional colorless scalars Φ_i^j was shown. Also was emphasized that, in spite of the equality of these two mass spectra, these direct and Seiberg's dual theories have different t' Hooft triangles and so are not equivalent, in contrast with the claim in [18] about their equivalence.

And finally, in this section 8 of [4] the extensive criticism was presented of attempts made in [19] to derive, similarly to [20], the Seiberg duality of the ordinary $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD starting from $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SQCD with $\mu_\mathrm{x} \ll \Lambda_2$ and evolving then to $\mu_\mathrm{x} \gg \Lambda_2$.

A Condensates and multiplicity of vacua at $N_F > 2N_c$ [4]

For the reader convenience, we reproduce here first some useful formulae for the theories (1.1),(1.2) from section 3 in [11] and from section 2 in [4].

The Konishi anomalies [12] for the i-th flavor look in the direct Φ - theory (1.1) as [11]

$$\langle\Phi_i\rangle\langle\frac{\partial\mathcal{W}_\Phi}{\partial\Phi_i}\rangle = 0\,, \quad \langle m_{Q,i}^{\mathrm{tot}}\rangle\langle\overline{Q}_i Q^i\rangle = \langle S\rangle\,, \quad \langle m_{Q,i}^{\mathrm{tot}}\rangle = m_Q - \langle\Phi_i\rangle\,, \quad \langle\Phi_i^j\rangle = \delta_i^j\langle\Phi_i\rangle,$$

$$\langle\Phi_j^i\rangle = \frac{1}{\mu_\Phi}\left(\langle\overline{Q}_j Q^i\rangle - \delta_j^i\frac{1}{N_c}\mathrm{Tr}\,\langle\overline{Q}Q\rangle\right), \quad \langle\overline{Q}_j Q^i\rangle \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{N_c}\langle\overline{Q}_j^a Q_a^i\rangle = \delta_j^i\langle\overline{Q}_i Q^i\rangle\,, \quad i = 1\,...\,N_F\,, \quad \text{(A.1)}$$

and $\langle m_{Q,i}^{\mathrm{tot}}\rangle$ is the value of the quark running mass at the scale $\mu = \Lambda_Q$.

At all scales until the field Φ remains too heavy and non-dynamical, i.e. until its perturbative running mass $\mu_\Phi^{\mathrm{pert}}(\mu) > \mu$, it can be integrated out and the superpotential takes the form

$$\mathcal{W}_Q = m_Q\mathrm{Tr}(\overline{Q}Q) - \frac{1}{2\mu_\Phi}\left(\sum_{i,j}(\overline{Q}_j Q^i)(\overline{Q}_i Q^j) - \frac{1}{N_c}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{Q}Q\Big)^2\right). \quad \text{(A.2)}$$

The values of the quark condensates for the i-th flavor, $\langle \overline{Q}_i Q^i \rangle$, in various vacua can be obtained from the effective superpotential [11] which accounts for all anomalies and depends only on quark bilinear combinations $\Pi^i_j = (\overline{Q}_j Q^i)$, see (A.1) for $(\overline{Q}_j Q^i)$ and (A.2) for $\mathcal{W}_Q$,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\rm eff}(\Pi) = -\overline{N}_c S + W_Q\,, \quad S = \Big(\frac{\det \overline{Q}Q}{\Lambda_Q^{\rm b_o}}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c}\,, \quad {\rm b_o} = 3N_c - N_F\,, \quad \overline{N}_c = N_F - N_c\,. \tag{A.3}$$

For the vacua with the spontaneously broken flavor symmetry, $U(N_F) \to U(n_1) \times U(n_2)$, the most convenient way to find the quark condensates is to use [11]

$$\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1 + (\overline{Q}Q)_2 - \frac{1}{N_c}{\rm Tr}\,(\overline{Q}Q)\,\rangle_{\rm br} = m_Q \mu_\Phi, \quad \langle S\rangle_{\rm br} = \Big(\frac{\det\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{\rm br}}{\Lambda_Q^{\rm b_o}}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c} = \frac{\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br}\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br}}{\mu_\Phi},$$

$$\det\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{\rm br} = \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle^{\rm n_1}_{\rm br}\,\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle^{\rm n_2}_{\rm br}\,, \quad (\overline{Q}Q)_1 \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \overline{Q}^a_1 Q^1_a\,, \quad (\overline{Q}Q)_2 \equiv \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \overline{Q}^a_2 Q^2_a\,, \tag{A.4}$$

$$\langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,1}\rangle_{\rm br} = m_Q - \langle \Phi_1\rangle_{\rm br} = \frac{\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br}}{\mu_\Phi}, \quad \langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,2}\rangle_{\rm br} = m_Q - \langle \Phi_2\rangle_{\rm br} = \frac{\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br}}{\mu_\Phi}\,.$$

The Konishi anomalies for the i-th flavor look in the dual $d\Phi$ - theory (1.2) as

$$\langle M_i\rangle\langle \overline{q}^i q_i\rangle = \Lambda_Q\langle S\rangle\,, \quad \frac{\langle \overline{q}^i q_i\rangle}{\Lambda_Q} = \langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,i}\rangle = m_Q - \frac{1}{\mu_\Phi}\,\langle M_i - \frac{1}{N_c}{\rm Tr}\,M\rangle\,, \quad i = 1\,...\,N_F\,. \tag{A.5}$$

In vacua with the broken flavor symmetry these can be rewritten as (recall that $\langle M^i_j\rangle = \delta^i_j\langle M_i\rangle$, $\langle M_1\rangle = \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle$, $\langle M_2\rangle = \langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle$)

$$\langle M_1 + M_2 - \frac{1}{N_c}{\rm Tr}\,M\rangle_{\rm br} = m_Q\mu_\Phi, \quad \langle S\rangle_{\rm br} = \Big(\frac{\det\langle M\rangle_{\rm br}}{\Lambda_Q^{\rm b_o}}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c} = \frac{1}{\mu_\Phi}\langle M_1\rangle_{\rm br}\langle M_2\rangle_{\rm br}\,,$$

$$\frac{\langle (\overline{q}q)_1\rangle_{\rm br}}{\Lambda_Q} = \frac{\langle S\rangle_{\rm br}}{\langle M_1\rangle_{\rm br}} = \frac{\langle M_2\rangle_{\rm br}}{\mu_\Phi} = \langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,1}\rangle_{\rm br}, \quad \frac{\langle (\overline{q}q)_2\rangle_{\rm br}}{\Lambda_Q} = \frac{\langle S\rangle_{\rm br}}{\langle M_2\rangle_{\rm br}} = \frac{\langle M_1\rangle_{\rm br}}{\mu_\Phi} = \langle m^{\rm tot}_{Q,1}\rangle_{\rm br}\,, \tag{A.6}$$

$$\frac{\langle (\overline{q}q)_2\rangle_{\rm br}}{\langle (\overline{q}q)_1\rangle_{\rm br}} = \frac{\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br}}{\langle (\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br}}\,, \quad (\overline{q}q)_1 \equiv \sum_{b=1}^{\overline{N}_c} \overline{q}^1_b q^b_1\,, \quad (\overline{q}q)_2 \equiv \sum_{b=1}^{\overline{N}_c} \overline{q}^2_b q^b_2\,, \quad \overline{N}_c \equiv N_F - N_c\,.$$

A.1 Vacua with the unbroken flavor symmetry

One obtains from (A.3) at $\mu_\Phi \lessapprox \mu_{\Phi,{\rm o}}$ and with $\langle \overline{Q}_j Q^i\rangle = \delta^i_j\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle\,,\ \langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \overline{Q}^a_1 Q^1_a\,.$ -

a) There are only $\overline{N}_c = (N_F - N_c)$ nearly classical S-vacua (S=small) at $\mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{\Phi,{\rm o}}$ with

$$\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_S \equiv \langle \overline{Q}Q(\mu = \Lambda_Q)\rangle_S \simeq -\frac{N_c}{\overline{N}_c}\, m_Q\mu_\Phi\,, \quad \mu_{\Phi,{\rm o}} = \Lambda_Q\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_F-2N_c}{N_c}} \ll \Lambda_Q\,, \tag{A.7}$$

$$\langle \Lambda^{(S)}_{YM}\rangle^3 \equiv \langle S\rangle_S = \Big(\frac{\det\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_S}{\Lambda_Q^{\rm b_o}}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c} \sim \Lambda^3_Q\Big(\frac{m\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda^2_Q}\Big)^{N_F/\overline{N}_c}\,.$$

b) There are $(N_F - 2N_c)$ quantum L-vacua (L=large) at $\mu_\Phi \gg \mu_{\Phi,\rm o}$ with

$$\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L \equiv \langle \overline{Q}Q(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle_L \sim \Lambda_Q^2 \left(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}}, \tag{A.8}$$

$$\langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(L)}\rangle^3 \equiv \langle S\rangle_L = \Big(\frac{\det\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_L}{\Lambda_Q^{\rm b_o}}\Big)^{1/\overline{N}_c} \sim \Lambda_Q^3 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_F}{N_F-2N_c}}.$$

c) There are N_c quantum QCD vacua at $\mu_\Phi \gg \mu_{\Phi,\rm o}$ with

$$\langle \overline{Q}Q\rangle_{QCD} = \langle \overline{Q}Q(\mu=\Lambda_Q)\rangle_{QCD} \simeq \frac{\langle S\rangle_{\rm QCD} \equiv \langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm QCD)}\rangle^3}{m_Q} \simeq \frac{1}{m_Q}\Big(\Lambda_Q^{\rm b_o} m_Q^{N_F}\Big)^{1/N_c}. \tag{A.9}$$

The total number of vacua with the unbroken flavor symmetry is

$$N_{\rm unbr}^{\rm tot} = (N_F - 2N_c) + N_c = \overline{N}_c\,. \tag{A.10}$$

A.2 Vacua with the broken flavor symmetry

$$U(N_F) \to U(n_1)\times U(n_2), \quad 1 \le n_1 \le [N_F/2]$$

a) There are $(n_1 - N_c)\overline{C}_{N_F}^{\rm n_1}$ br1-vacua [3] (br=breaking, with the dominant $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle$) at $N_c < n_1 \le [N_F/2]$ and $\mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{\Phi,\rm o}$ with

$$\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1} \simeq \frac{N_c}{N_c - n_1} m_Q \mu_\Phi, \quad \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1} \sim \Lambda_Q^2 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_1}{n_1-N_c}} \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2-N_c}{n_1-N_c}}, \tag{A.11}$$

$$\langle S\rangle_{\rm br1} = \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1}}{\mu_\Phi} \sim \Lambda_Q^3 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_1}{n_1-N_c}} \Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2-n_1}{n_1-N_c}}, \quad \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1}}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}} \sim \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\mu_{\Phi,\rm o}}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{n_1-N_c}} \ll 1\,.$$

b) There are $(n_2 - N_c)\overline{C}_{N_F}^{\rm n_1}$ br2 -vacua at all values $1 \le n_1 \le [N_F/2]$ and $\mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{\Phi,\rm o}$ with

$$\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br2} \simeq \frac{N_c}{N_c - n_2} m_Q \mu_\Phi\,, \quad \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br2} \sim \Lambda_Q^2 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2}{n_2-N_c}} \Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{N_c-n_1}{n_2-N_c}}, \tag{A.12}$$

$$\langle \Lambda_{YM}^{(\rm br2)}\rangle^3 \equiv \langle S\rangle_{\rm br2} \sim \Lambda_Q^3 \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2}{n_2-N_c}} \Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2-n_1}{n_2-N_c}}, \quad \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br2}}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br2}} \sim \Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\mu_{\Phi,\rm o}}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{n_2-N_c}} \ll 1\,.$$

On the whole, there are ($\theta(z)$ is the step function)

$$N_{\rm br}^{\rm tot}(n_1) = \Big[(n_2 - N_c) + \theta(n_1 - N_c)(n_1 - N_c)\Big]\overline{C}_{N_F}^{\rm n_1},\ N_{\rm br}^{\rm tot} = \sum_{n_1=1}^{[N_F/2]} N_{\rm br}^{\rm tot}(n_1)\,,\ {\rm n_1 + n_2} = N_F \tag{A.13}$$

vacua with the broken flavor symmetry at $\mu_\Phi \ll \mu_{\Phi,\rm o}$.

[3] $\overline{C}_{N_F}^{n_1}$ differ from the standard $C_{N_F}^{n_1} = N_F!/[n_1!\,n_2!]$ only for $\overline{C}_{N_F=2\rm k}^{n_1=\rm k} = C_{N_F=2\rm k}^{n_1=\rm k}/2$.
Besides, by convention, we ignore the continuous multiplicity of vacua due to the spontaneous flavor symmetry breaking. Another way, one can separate slightly all quark masses, so that all Nambu-Goldstone particles will acquire small masses $O(\delta m_Q) \ll \overline{m}_Q$.

c) There are $(N_c-n_1)C^{n_1}_{N_F}$ br1 -vacua at $1\le n_1<N_c$ and $\mu_\Phi\gg\mu_{\Phi,o}$ with

$$\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}\simeq\frac{N_c}{N_c-n_1}m_Q\mu_\Phi,\quad \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1}\sim\Lambda_Q^2\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{n_1}{N_c-n_1}}\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2-N_c}{N_c-n_1}}, \tag{A.14}$$

$$\langle\Lambda^{(\rm br1)}_{YM}\rangle^3\equiv\langle S\rangle_{\rm br1}\sim\Lambda_Q^3\Big(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{n_1}{N_c-n_1}}\Big(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{n_2-n_1}{N_c-n_1}},\qquad \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm br1}}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm br1}}\sim\Big(\frac{\mu_{\Phi,o}}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_c-n_1}}\ll1\,.$$

d) There are $(N_F-2N_c)\overline{C}^{n_1}_{N_F}$ Lt (Lt=L-type) vacua at $n_1\ne N_c$ and $\mu_\Phi\gg\mu_{\Phi,o}$ with

$$(1-\frac{n_1}{N_c})\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm Lt}\simeq-(1-\frac{n_2}{N_c})\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm Lt}\sim\Lambda_Q^2\left(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}}, \tag{A.15}$$

i.e. as in the L-vacua in (A.8) but $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm Lt}\ne\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm Lt}$ here.

e) There are $(N_F-2N_c)C^{n_1}_{N_F}$ special vacua at $n_1=N_c$ and $\mu_\Phi\gg\mu_{\Phi,o}$ with

$$\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm spec}=\frac{N_c}{2N_c-N_F}m_Q\mu_\Phi,\ \langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm spec}=Z_{2N_c-N_F}\Lambda_Q^2\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}},\ Z_{2N_c-N_F}=\exp\{\frac{2\pi i\,k}{N_F-2N_c}\},$$

$$\langle\Lambda^{(\rm spec)}_{YM}\rangle^3\equiv\langle S\rangle_{\rm spec}\sim m_Q\Lambda_Q^2\Big(\frac{\mu_\Phi}{\Lambda_Q}\Big)^{\frac{\overline{N}_c}{N_F-2N_c}},\quad \frac{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle_{\rm spec}}{\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle_{\rm spec}}\sim\Big(\frac{\mu_{\Phi,o}}{\mu_\Phi}\Big)^{\frac{N_c}{N_F-2N_c}}\ll1\,. \tag{A.16}$$

As one can see from the above, similarly to [11] with $N_c<N_F<2N_c$, all quark condensates become parametrically the same at $\mu_\Phi\sim\mu_{\Phi,o}$, see (A.7). Clearly, just this region $\mu_\Phi\sim\mu_{\Phi,o}$ and not $\mu_\Phi\sim\Lambda_Q$ is very special and most of the quark condensates change their parametric behavior and hierarchies at $\mu_\Phi\lesseqgtr\mu_{\Phi,o}$. For example, the br1 - vacua with $1\le n_1<N_c$, $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle\sim m_Q\mu_\Phi\gg\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle$ at $\mu_\Phi\gg\mu_{\Phi,o}$ evolve into br2 - vacua with $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle\sim m_Q\mu_\Phi\gg\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle$ at $\mu_\Phi\ll\mu_{\Phi,o}$, while the br1 - vacua with $n_1>N_c$, $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle\sim m_Q\mu_\Phi\gg\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle$ at $\mu_\Phi\ll\mu_{\Phi,o}$ evolve into the L-type vacua with $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle\sim\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle\sim\Lambda_Q^2\,(\mu_\Phi/\Lambda_Q)^{\overline{N}_c/(N_F-2N_c)}$ at $\mu_\Phi\gg\mu_{\Phi,o}$, etc.

The exception is the special vacua with $n_1=N_c$, $n_2=\overline{N}_c$. In these, the parametric behavior $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle\sim m_Q\mu_\Phi$, $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle\sim\Lambda_Q^2\,(\mu_\Phi/\Lambda_Q)^{\overline{N}_c/(N_F-2N_c)}$ remains the same but the hierarchy is reversed at $\mu_\Phi\lesseqgtr\mu_{\Phi,o}$: $\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_1\rangle/\langle(\overline{Q}Q)_2\rangle\sim(\mu_\Phi/\mu_{\Phi,o})^{N_c/(N_F-2N_c)}$.

On the whole, there are

$$N^{\rm tot}_{\rm br}(n_1)=\Big[(N_F-2N_c)+\theta(N_c-n_1)(N_c-n_1)\Big]\overline{C}^{n_1}_{N_F},\quad N^{\rm tot}_{\rm br}=\sum_{n_1=1}^{[N_F/2]}N^{\rm tot}_{\rm br}(n_1) \tag{A.17}$$

vacua with the broken flavor symmetry at $\mu_\Phi\gg\mu_{\Phi,o}$. The total number of vacua is the same at $\mu_\Phi\lesseqgtr\mu_{\Phi,o}$, as it should be.

We point out finally that the multiplicities of vacua at $N_F>2N_c$ are not the analytic continuations of those at $N_c<N_F<2N_c$, see section 3 in [11].

References

[1] V.L. Chernyak, Mass spectra in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD with additional colorless fields. Strong coupling regimes, arXiV:1608.06452 [hep-th]

[2] V. Novikov, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, V. Zakharov, Exact Gell-Mann-Low function of supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories from instanton calculus, Nucl. Phys. **B 229** (1983) 381

[3] M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, Solution of the anomaly puzzle in SUSY gauge theories and the Wilson operator expansion, Nucl. Phys. **B 277** (1986) 456

[4] V.L. Chernyak, Mass spectra in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD with additional fields. III, arXiv:1308.5863 [hep-th]

[5] N. Seiberg, Electric - magnetic duality in supersymmetric nonabelian gauge theories, Nucl. Phys. **B 435** (1995) 129, hep-th/9411149

[6] K.A. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, Lectures on supersymmetric gauge theories and electric-magnetic duality, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl., **45BC** (1996) 1

[7] V.L. Chernyak, On mass spectrum in SQCD and problems with the Seiberg duality. Equal quark masses, JETP **110** (2010) 383, arXiv:0712.3167 [hep-th]

[8] V.L. Chernyak, On mass spectrum in SQCD and problems with the Seiberg duality. Another scenario, JETP **114** (2012) 61, arXiv:0811.4283 [hep-th]

[9] G. Veneziano, S. Yankielowicz, An effective Lagrangian for the pure $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, Phys. Lett. **B 113** (1982) 231

[10] T. Taylor, G. Veneziano, S. Yankielowicz, Supersymmetric QCD and its massless limit: an effective Lagrangian analysis, Nucl. Phys. **B 218** (1983) 493

[11] V.L. Chernyak, Mass spectra in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD with additional fields. I, arXiV:1205.0410 [hep-th]

[12] K. Konishi, Anomalous supersymmetry transformation of some composite operators in SQCD, Phys. Lett. **B 135** (1984) 439

[13] Nathan Seiberg, Exact results on the space of vacua of four dimensional SUSY gauge theories, Phys. Rev., **D49** (1994) 6857, hep-th/9402044

[14] Ian Affleck, Michael Dine, Nathan Seiberg, Dynamical supersymmetry breaking in supersymmetric QCD, Nucl.Phys. **B 241** (1984) 493

[15] K.A. Intriligator, N. Seiberg, D. Shih, Dynamical SUSY breaking in meta-stable vacua, JHEP 0604: 021 (2006); hep-th/0602239

[16] M. Shifman, A. Yung, Non-Abelian duality and confinement in N=2 supersymmetric QCD, Phys. Rev. **D 79** (2009) 125012, hep-th/0904.1035

[17] V.L. Chernyak, Mass spectra in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SQCD with additional fields. II, arXiV:1211.1487 [hep-th]

[18] M. Shifman, A. Yung, Detailing $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Seiberg's duality through the Seiberg-Witten solution of $\mathcal{N} = 2$, Phys.Rev. **D 87** (2013) 106009, arXiv:1304.0822 [hep-th]

[19] M. Shifman, A. Yung, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ duality in the chiral limit from $\mathcal{N} = 2$ duality, Phys. Rev. **D 90** (2014) 065014, arXiv:1403.6086 [hep-th]

[20] P.C. Argyres, M.R. Plesser, N. Seiberg, The moduli space of vacua of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QCD and duality in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY QCD, Nucl. Phys. **B 483** (1996) 159, hep-th/9603042